

10. 5. 9. 1
THE
MODERATOR

BETWEEN AN

Infidel and an Apostate:

OR, THE

CONTROVERSY

BETWEEN

The AUTHOR of the Discourse of
*The Grounds and Reasons of the
Christian Religion;*

AND

His Reverend Ecclesiastical OPPONENTS;
Set in a CLEAR LIGHT.

With an Exhortation to a zealous
Debate of it.

Iliacos intra Muros peccatur & extra.

The Third Edition.

By *THOMAS WOOLSTON*, B.D.
fometime Fellow of *Sidney College in Cambridge.*

L O N D O N:

Printed for the Author, and sold by him next
Door below the Star in *Aldermanbury*; and
by the Booksellers of *London and Westminster.*
1729.

[Price Two Shillings and Six Pence.]

10

MODERATOR

OF THE

CONSTITUTION

MUSEVM
BRITAN
NICVM



T O T H E

Most Reverend Father in G O D,

W I L L I A M,

Lord Archbishop of *Canterbury*.

My LORD,



ESIDES several Discourses, under the Title of *Free-Gifts*, which I have presented to you, as well as to the others of the *Clergy*; I have heretofore Dedictaed to your Great
Name,

iv *The Dedication.*

Name, a Latin Dissertation, De Pontij Pilati Epistola ad Tiberium circa Res Jesu Christi gestas; which, tho' it is but a little one, was, I presume, no less acceptable to You, than a Volume of the largest Size.

The Reason that I dedicated that Dissertation to you, was not, because of your high Station in the Church, nor in Hopes of Rewards and Preferments, which are the common Motives to *Dedications*; but because of your singular Skill in Antiquity, and consequently of your Ability to pass a true Judgment on it.

For the same Reason I now dedicate this Discourse to your *Lordship*, and appeal to your nice Judgment, whether I have assumed to my self the Office of a *Moderator* in a Controversy, which I
am

The Dedication. V

am not able to conduct and determine.

The Growth of Infidelity within these Kingdoms, can't but be a Grief to your self, as well as to all other good Christians: And the Desires and Endeavours of the *Clergy* to put a Stop to it, are commendable, but how unsuccessful they have hitherto been, Experience does demonstrate: Nay, what is most lamentable, those very *Treatises*, which are sincerely meant for the Defence of Christianity, are unfortunately turn'd to its Disadvantage by our *Adversaries*, who are always picking up one Thing or other out of them, with which they insult the *Authors*, and wound our Religion to the Quick.

The *Author* of the *Discourse of the Grounds*, &c. is one of these our
b Adver-

vi *The Dedication.*

Adversaries, to whom *Celsus* and *Porphyry*, for Subtilty and Learning, are not to be compared. By his writing against the Prophecies of the Old Testament, he strikes home at the *Messiahship* of our *Jesus*; and he has so distress'd the *Clergy* with this double Game of literal and allegorical Interpretations, that they know not where to have him, nor upon what Principles to oppose him, because of the unhappy Consequences that follow on them.

Such is your *Lordship's* great Learning, and Zeal for the *Messiahship* of our *Jesus*, that was you not hinder'd by other weighty Affairs, for the Good of the Publick, I believe you would appear a Champion in this Cause, and perform much better against the *Adversary*, than any of our Ecclesiastical Writers at present have done.

It

The Dedication. vii

It was but by Chance, *My Lord*, that I read the *Discourse of the Grounds*, &c. many Months after its Publication, or I should have wrote such an Answer to it, upon the Rationality, Authority, and Antiquity of the allegorical Interpretation of the Scriptures, as should have stopp'd the Mouth of its Author ; or at least have put him to greater Shifts and Subterfuges than he has done the *Clergy* : But since others are before-hand with me in their Oppositions to him, I will now only interpose as a *Moderator* ; and if the *Clergy* are not wilful and head-strong to their Ruin and Dishonour, I will help them out of the Briars and Thorns of this Controversy.

The several Writers of the little
Pamphlets, that appear'd first against
b 2 the

viii *The Dedication.*

the *Adversary*, are such *Triflers*, that I believe he despises them to the last Degree; but they took Care, some of them, to sound a Trumpet of the Fame of the Work of the *Bishop* of *Lichfield*, that was coming after them, to the utter Overthrow and Confutation of the *Adversary*.

Many *Months* has the *Press* been Pregnant with this *Bishop's* Work, of which she is at last deliver'd, but whether to the Joy of the Church and *Clergy*, is more than I can tell.

Though I knew nothing of the Fame of the *Bishop* of *Lichfield*, before the Talk of this expected mountainous Production; yet I gave into the common Opinion of his Learning and Abilities, and hoped that he, being a Man of an
Able

The Dedication. ix

Able Hand, as (a) one says, would have knock'd down the *Adversary* at once, and so have render'd the Labours and Studies of others, this Way, for the future, needless.

It was with Impatience, that I my self waited for the coming forth of this *Bishop's* Book, which I, hearing of his Skill in old Authors, hoped might have saved me this Trouble, which, whether I have now unnecessarily taken upon my self, your *Lordship* is to judge.

Whether you will think that I have acted the Part of a fair *Moderator* in all Points, is more than I can guess: But you can't suspect me of Disaffection to the Christian Religion, or of Inclination to Infide-

(a) Mr. *Newcome*, in the Dedication of his Sermon to Dr. *Snape*.

lity ;

X *The Dedication.*

lity ; neither can you, I humbly conceive, find any Fault in me, unless you, as a Lover of the Church of *England*, and of her Clergy, may think I sometimes handle them with too much Severity, and pass such Reflections upon them for Ignorance, Sloth, and Apostacy, as might be better spared.

That I have no natural Averfion to the Clergy, is notorious. Your Lordship sees I have been educated amongst them ; and I had contracted such a Love for their Order and Function, that I thought was unalterable. It is my Misfortune, as well as their Fault, that there is a Breach between us, which is not to be made up : And if you should think me too warm, and sometimes even fired with Indignation against some of them, there are those, such as the present *Dean of Gloucester*,
and

The Dedication. xi

and others, who, in my Vindication, can account for it.

But passing by all Considerations of the unhappy Difference between my self and the *Clergy*, the Question is, Whether I am an able and fit *Moderator* of this Controversy; which cannot be determined, but upon the Authority of the *Antients*, particularly of the Fathers of the Church. The *Clergy* at this Day would be thought Learned; but their Ignorance of the primitive Writings, is and will be their Reproach. Excepting your *Lordship*, and perhaps one or two more, the *Clergy* in general are such Strangers to the Fathers, that they have no Knowledge nor Conception of what they treat of. The true old Christian Religion, I believe, will arise to Life again, out of the Primitive Church, to the Surprize and Disappointment

Xii *The Dedication.*

pointment of modern Professors :
In the mean Time, without Vanity,
or begging your *Lordship's* good
Word, I dare say, you will give it
as your Opinion, that for Use of,
and Conversation with the Fathers,
there is not an Equal to,

My LORD,

Your Lordship's

most humble,

and devoted Servant,

London, Feb. 10.
1725.

Tho. Woolston.

T H E



[1]
THE
MODERATOR

BETWEEN AN
Infidel and an Apostate, &c.



Have endeavour'd, to the utmost of my Power, to engage the Clergy in a Controversy on this Question, *Whether the Hireling Priests of this Age, who are all Ministers of the Letter, be not Worshippers of the Apocalyptical BEAST, and Ministers of ANTI-CHRIST?* But all the Persuasions I have given them in the several

A

Free-

Free-Gifts, or Challenges, I have publish'd to that Purpose, are as yet ineffectual; and I have not been able to get one *Opponent*, unless I must except the *Country-Curate*, who indeed is a considerable *Wrirer*, that has as strenuously attack'd me, as any *dignified Priest* can; but for all that, I am allow'd to set him aside as *No Body*; it being agreed between us, that he is not to be accounted a potent Adversary, till he has farther proved the allegorical way of interpreting the Scriptures to be an old Error of the *Jews, Apostles, and Fathers* of the Church; and also the Reasonableness of an *Hireling Priesthood*, which I believe will be long first.

I have been repeatedly indeed threaten'd, with an Answer, from Mr. *Allen*, the *Rector* of *Kettering* in *Northamptonshire*, who takes it heinously, as it appears by his Letters to me, that I should say in my *Fourth Free-Gift*, he'll hardly publish any Thing against me before *Latter Lammas*; but, notwithstanding his Resentments, I believe, I must adjourn my Expectations of his Answer till that Time.

Being then disappointed of a *Controversy*, in which I should have taken abundance of Pleasure, if any of the learned Clergy had vouchsafed me their Opposition on the *Question propos'd*, I take Leave
to

to interpose, and act the Part of a *Moderator* in *another*, between the *Author of the Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion*, on the one Hand, who is look'd on as an *Infidel*; and the *several Ecclesiastical Writers against him*, on the other, whom I account *Apostates*. And I would not dare to intermeddle in this *Controversy*, if I did not know my self of Capacity and Abilities to conduct and determine it; being, without Vanity, *Master of all that Learning*, that is requisite for one in the *Chair of a Moderator* in it. And I promise both *Parties* to do them Justice in a fair Representation of their Reasonings and Argumentations. Neither can I be suspected of Partiality to either Side; for I have written more in Defence of *Christianity*, than to be suspected, by the *Clergy*, as a Favourer of the *Author of the Discourse*, &c. and on the other Hand, I have more freely used the *Clergy* in my Writings, than to be excepted against by *that Author*, as an improper Judge and *Moderator* between them. Therefore, without any more Preface, the Matter in Debate between these Two contending Parties, may be thus truly stated, under this Question.

Whether the Law of Moses, and the Prophets, are not entirely typical and prophetical

phetical of Christ and his Church; and it be not impossible to prove the Truth of Christianity, or the Messiahship of our Jesus, any otherwise than by shewing how he does and will fulfil the Prophecies of him in the Old Testament.

The *Author* of the *Discourse of the Grounds, &c.* holds, or rather seems to hold the *Affirmative* of this Question; and produces several Testimonies and Arguments from the Evangelists and Apostles, and other Authors, to show, that the *Affirmative* of it ought to be maintain'd; but, because he discerns not any Harmony between the *New and Old Testament*, nor how our *Jesus* has, either in a literal or allegorical Sense, fulfill'd the Types and Prophecies, that are commonly apply'd to him; he thereupon, excepting against any other Arguments of *Jesus's Messiahship* drawn from his Miracles, doth slyly insinuate, that the Proofs of the Truth of Christianity are not valid.

I believe the *Author* of the *Discourse, &c.* can't dislike this short Representation of the Design of *his Book*, much less can he find Fault with the State of the Question above, which, if he please to write more openly against Christianity, will give him more Scope to make his Objections to it.

On

On the other Hand, the *Clergy*, who are *Writers* against the *Discourse* of the *Grounds*, &c. and zealous Advocates for the Truth of their Religion, seem distress'd and perplex'd about a proper *Answer* to be given to it. They earnestly contend for *Types* and *Prophecies* in the *Old Testament*, which our *Jesus* has fulfill'd in the *New*, tho they know not how to adapt the *Antitype* to the *Type*: And they are particularly zealous for the Truth of those *Prophecies* that are cited in the *Evangelists*; which, whether the *Author* of the *Discourse*, &c. understand the Pertinency of them, or not, to our *Jesus*, ought to be taken on the Word of those inspired Writers, for true *Prophecies*, and right *Completions*. But after all, they will not allow Christianity to be alone founded on the *Old Testament*; nor the *Messiahship* of *Jesus* on his *Completion* of the *Prophecies* that went before of him; but insist on other Arguments of his *Messiahship*, drawn from the Excellency of his *Doctrine*, and Power of his *Miracles*; which, with or without *Prophecy*, are sufficient Grounds for his *Divine Authority*, as they say, and for our Faith in him.

This also is a short Representation of the *Answers* the *Clergy* have made to the fore-said *Discourse* of the *Grounds*, &c. and
is

is as faithful a one as can be drawn up in the Compass of so few Words. I am persuaded the *Writers* of them will approve of this Representation; neither can they say I have unfairly stated the Question in Debate between them.

I come now, by the Leave of these *Combatants*, to interpose, and freely to deliver my Opinion upon the Question in Dispute; which is this, That the *Affirmative* of it ought to be maintain'd by Christians, otherwise it will be impossible to vindicate the Truth of Christianity, or to prove our *Jesus* to be the true *Messiah*. This my Opinion can't but please the *Author* of the *Discourse*, &c. For if it is not possible to prove the Scriptures of the *Old Testament* to consist entirely of Prophecies of the *New*, and that our *Jesus* does, and will fulfil all that is written in the Law and the Prophets; then I give an Advantage to his Objection, and the Truth of Christianity must be yielded up to *Jews* and *Infidels*. On the other Hand, the *Clergy* can't be offended with this my Opinion, if the *Affirmative* of the Question may be clearly and evidently proved and made out; because Christianity thereby will be establish'd on its sure Foundation; the *Author* of the *Discourse*, &c. will be beaten with his own Sword and Principles; and the Church

Church of Christ will triumph over all her Enemies.

Acting the Part of a *Moderator*, I am not now to take in Hand any Portion of the Scriptures of the Old Testament, and to show how it is Prophetical, and how our Jesus has fulfill'd it ; but at present am only to lay before you my Reasons for this my Opinion in the Question in Debate, and then to exhort the *Clergy* on the one Side, for the Honour of *Jesus's Messiahship*, and the Truth of his Religion, to adhere to, and illustrate the *Affirmative* of it : And on the other Side, to excite the *Author of the Discourse*, &c. who has rightly and closely attack'd Christianity, to persist in his Objection, and with the like Art and Industry to improve it, 'till the *Clergy* have either clearly proved *Jesus's Messiahship* from manifest Completion of Prophecies ; or given up his Religion to *Jews* and *Infidels*.

Now the Reasons for my Opinion, and for my holding the Affirmative of the Question, as above stated, are these Four.

I. Because Jesus himself plainly and expressly enough signifies, that the Law and the Prophets consist of Types and Prophecies of him, and that he came for the Completion of all that was written in them ;

them ; therefore it must be incumbent on Christians to prove intelligibly, how he does and will fulfil them accordingly ; or they ought to give *him* up for a *Deceiver*, a vain *Pretender*, and a false *Messiah*.

II. Because the antient *Jews* believed the Law and the Prophets to be typical and prophetical of the Life, Reign, and Kingdom of the expected Messiah, and how He would fulfil all that was written in them ; therefore it behoves Christians to prove, that our Jesus does fulfil the Writings of *Moses* and the Prophets accordingly ; or they can't evince him to be the *Messias* against the *Jews*, nor expect their Conversion to Christianity, if they insist on their old Principles and Opinions.

III. Because the Apostles and Fathers of the Church do hold the *Old Testament* to be prophetical of the *New*, and that our Jesus, under the Dispensation of the Gospel, did and would fulfil all that was written in the Law and the Prophets, which too they mightily labour'd to prove. Consequently it is the Duty of Christians to persist in, and endeavour to clear up that Proof, or give up the Apostles and Fathers of the Church for *Sons of Error*, *Believers* in a false *Messias*, or at least, for
Enter-

Entertainers of wrong Conceptions concerning our *Jesus*.

IV. Because no other Arguments (whether taken from the Excellency of his Doctrine, or Power of his Miracles) are of any Validity to prove the Divine Authority and Messiahship of *Jesus*, if *this* from Prophecy, in the first Place, be not made manifest, and evidently clear'd up.

These are the Reasons why I hold the *Affirmative* of the Question in Dispute, and why I think Christians ought to maintain it. If I make it manifest that these Reasons are good ones, then I have no more to do, than to animate and encourage the *Clergy*, and the *Author* of the *Discourse*, &c, to proceed in, and prosecute the Controversy between them with Warmth and Vigor, till the one has overthrown Christianity, or the other establish'd it on its sure Foundation of the Law and the Prophets. And I will do the Part of a fair *Moderator* between them ; I will assist the one in his Opposition to Christianity, and the other in their Defence of it ; Neither will I be at all Partial, excepting in that, as a Believer in the *Messiahship* of our *Jesus*, I can't be indifferent about the Event of the Controversy,

versy, nor unconcernedly behold the *Author of the Discourse, &c.* with his Wit, Subtilty, and Learning, to run down the Christian Religion; but will, if need be, put the Clergy in the way where and how to begin their Interpretations of the Types and Prophecies of the Old Testament, and will be ready at Hand to help them out at any dead Lift in this Work.

I. The First Reason then why I hold, and think Christians ought to hold the Affirmative of the Question in Dispute, is, *Because Jesus himself plainly and expressly enough signifies, that the Law and the Prophets consist of Types and Prophecies of him; and that he came for the Completion of all that was written in them: Therefore it is incumbent on Christians to prove how he does and will fulfil them accordingly, or they ought to give him up for a Deceiver, a vain Pretender, and a False Messiah.*

And the first Text I shall cite to this Purpose, is *Matth. v. 17, 18.* where Jesus says, *Think not that I am come to destroy the Law and the Prophets, I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill; for verily I say unto you, till Heaven and Earth pass, one Jet or one Tittle shall in no wise pass from the Law, till all be fulfill'd.* The plain
and

and obvious Sense of which Words is, that the whole Law and the Prophets are Typical and Prophetical of *Jesus*, and that he came to fulfil every Circumstance of their Writings: Neither is it possible, without Force and Perversion of the Words, to put any other Sense on them. And notwithstanding some Modern Commentators, not apprehending how the Law and the Prophets can be entirely prophetical of *Jesus*, have strain'd the Words to a less significant Purpose; yet I appeal to themselves, whether this be not the Sense they would willingly subscribe to, if it could be proved, how our *Jesus* has fulfill'd the Law and the Prophets according to it. The *Author of the Discourse*, &c. understands this (a) Text as I do, and refers to it for the Service of his Purpose, and he is much in the right on't; neither does he put any other Sense on it, than what (b) *Origen*, (c) *Theophylact*, and other Fathers assert and contend for.

(a) Page 5. 15.

(b) Ego credens verbis domini mei Jesu Christi, in Lege & Prophetis jota quidem unum, aut unum Apicem non puto esse Mysteriis vacuum, nec aliquid horum transire posse, donec omnia fiant. *Hom. in Exod. cap. 1.*

(c) Επληρωσιν τον νομον, τωτεςιν, ανεπληρωσεν, οσα γαρ εκεινος εσκηγεραφεν, ταυτα ουτος τελειως εωγεραφεν. In Loc.

Again, Luke xxiv. 44. Jesus says, *All Things must be fulfill'd, which were written in the Law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms concerning him.* What can any one think less from these Words, than that all the Writings of Moses, and of the Prophets, and of the Hagiographers, are entirely typical and prophetical of Jesus? If in some few Passages only of their Writings, there had been Prophecy, as is commonly supposed by Modern Divines, Jesus would surely have specified them, or, at least, with some Restriction have said, that those particular Things might be fulfill'd, which are here and there, in abrupt Sentences, scatter'd and interspers'd in the Writings of the Old Testament. But this Text is to be interpreted by the above cited, and nothing less can be meant by it, than that all the Writings of Moses and the Prophets, are wholly, and in every Part, prophetical of Christ and his Church. And this is another Text that the Author (d) of the Discourse, &c. cites for the Service of his Cause, or in Defence of the Affirmative of the Question in Dispute; and it is rightly understood by him, upon the ample Testi-

monies of the Fathers, that might be produced to this Purpose.

Again, *Jesus* says, *John* v. 46. *Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me, for he wrote of me.* By which Words we ought to understand, consistently with the Texts above cited, that *Moses* wrote a prophetical and typical History of *Christ* and his Church. It is ridiculous to imagine, as some Commentators do, that *Jesus*, when he said *Moses wrote of him*, only pointed at *Deuter. xviii. ver. 15, 18.* where *Moses* says, *A Prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you, like unto me*, as might be argued at large. However, if any think I put too extensive a Sense upon the Words, I can tell them, I have the Authority of (e) *St. Augustin*, (f) *Theophylact*, and other Fathers for it; and from their Explication of the Text, we are to understand, that the Five Books of *Moses* are a Treatise of *Jesus* and his Church, under Types and Figures.

Again, our Saviour exhorts us, *John* v. 39. *to search the Scriptures, for in them ye*

(e) *Quinque Libri Moſis nihil aliud quam Chriſtum prædicant, ſicut ipſe ait, ſi crederetis Moſi, crederetis forſitan & mihi, ille enim de me ſcripſit. In Quaſt. 64. Divers. Quaſt.*

(f) *Εγγραφε γαρ τα εν λογοις, τα εν σημειοις, και τα εν συμβολοις. In Loc.*

think ye have eternal Life, and they are they which testify of me. This Text also the *Author (g)* of the *Discourse*, &c. refers to, as a Proof, that Christianity is alone founded on the Old Testament, and that the *Messiahship* of *Jesus* is only to be proved from the Testimony of the Prophecy of it. And I think so of it. For what can be meant less by this Text, than that the Scriptures of the Old Testament bear a Testimony to *Jesus* by the Spirit of Prophecy; and that they alone are to be search'd into for a Proof of his being the *Messiah*, and Completion of them.

I shall quote at present no more of the Sayings of our Saviour himself to our Purpose. Any one of these Texts do sufficiently intimate, that the *Old Testament* consists of Prophecies of our *Jesus*; but all of them taken together, and interpreted one by another, do abundantly manifest, that Christianity, as the *Author of the Discourse* would suggest, is founded on the Testimony of the Law and the Prophets; consequently if it can't be proved that our *Jesus* does and will fulfil the Types and Predictions that are contain'd in them, He is to be rejected as a false *Messiah*, a Decei-

ver, and a vain Pretender to fulfil Prophecies; which neither He, nor any of his Disciples, have hitherto proved to have such a Relation to him, that *Jews* and *Infidels* have not made plausible Objections against. But,

II. The Second Reason, why I am for holding the Affirmative of the Question above, is, *Because the antient Jews believ'd the Law and the Prophets to be Typical and Prophetical of the Life, Reign, and Kingdom of their expected Messiah: Therefore it behoves Chirstians to prove our Jesus to have fulfill'd the Writings of Moses and the Prophets accordingly, or they can't manifest him to be the Messiah to the Jews, nor expect their Conversion to Christianity, if they insist on their old Principles and Opinions.*

That the antient *Jews* held the Law and the Prophets to be entirely Typical and Prophetical of the Life, Reign, and Kingdom of the *Messiah*, is plain not only from what (b) Mr. Meyer, a late converted *Jew*,

(b) Omnia quæ a Mose & Prophetis olim de vero Messia prædicta sunt, per typos & figuras proponuntur, eo quod Omnes Prophetiæ visæ sunt filiis Israelis, quasi umbræ & figuræ, quæ postremis Temporibus, omnes & singulæ implebuntur. *De Christi Generat.* p. 145, & 175.

says,

says, but from much more which might be collected out of their Writings to this Purpose, than can be transcribed in a short Time. As our Saviour says, that *all Things must be fulfill'd that are written in the Law and the Prophets, and in the Psalms concerning him*; so (i) *Jesirah*, the antient Jew, says, that *all Things of the Law and the Prophets, and the Hagiographers, have a prophetical Aspect to the Wisdom of God, by whom they meant the Messiah*. But the Opinion of the *Cabalists*, of *Philo Judeus*; and of the *Therapents*, who were all for the mystical Interpretation of the Law and the Prophets, does abundantly shew this; for in an allegorical and mystical Sense, did they believe the *Messiah* would fulfil them, which was the Reason that they apply'd themselves to that Study against his Coming. As our *Jesus* says, that *not one jot, nor one Tittle of the Law shall pass, till all be fulfill'd*; so the antient *Jews* (k) believed there was not *one Word, nor so much as a Letter of the Law*, that was not mysterious, and would not receive its Illustration in the Days of the

(i) *Omnia quæ commemorata in Lege, in Prophetis & Hagiographis alludunt ad sapientiam, &c. apud Ritangel. p. 55.*

(k) *Basnage's History of the Jews, p. 189.*

Messiah. And this mystical or prophetic Interpretation of the Law, which the *Jews* delighted in, they (l) received, as was supposed, by Tradition from *Moses*, who was taught it of God, and deliver'd it to the Elders; which is probable, not only upon what (m) *Origen* and (n) *St. Hilary* intimate of *Moses's* understanding the prophetic Meaning of his own Writings, and of his instructing the Elders in it, but because he had a Vision upon the Mount with God, of the Pattern, or grand Exemplar of all Things he wrote of; which *Archetypal* Pattern of all Things was, in the Opinion of the *Jews*, Apostles, and Fathers of the Church, no other than the Spiritual and Prophetic Meaning and Form of the Things he wrote a typical

(l) *Assēverant Judæi, Deum Mōi primum Legem scriptam tradidisse, atque hanc postea in longo illo Dierum 40 spatio quo in monte apud se agebat Moses, exposuisse, ita ut singulorum Præceptorum genuinum sensum, Causas & fines, tum Rationem quoque eadem adimplendi, illi accurate declararet. Wagenf. Tel. ignea. p. 580.*

(m) *Perspicuum est Mōsem mentis acie Legis veritatem, Historiarumque atque scriptarum Allegorias juxta Anagogen vidisse. In Johan. Tom. 6.*

(n) *Nam idem Moses, quamvis Veteris Testamenti Verba in Litteris condidisset, tamen separatim quedam ex occultis Legis secretiora mysteria septuaginta senioribus, qui Doctores deinceps manerent intimaverat. In Ps. 2. Scit. 2.*

and figurative Story of. And besides all this, I have a Demonstration in Hand, to be produced upon Occasion, that *Moses* understood himself the mystical Meaning of his Law, and imparted it to others, or the antient *Jews* could never have hit so luckily on such prophetical Interpretations as they did, in relation to the *Messiah*, and as our *Jesus* fulfill'd them, if they had not receiv'd them by Inspiration from God, or by Tradition from *Moses*.

But what's remarkable, the *Seventy Interpreters*, who, in the Opinion of the *Jews*, were (o) *Cabalists*, held all Things of the Law and the Prophets to be Prophe-tical of the Messiah ; which, if my Word is not to be taken for't at present, will in Time be demonstrated. And this is the Reason that they, being skill'd in the my-stical and prophetical Interpretation of the Scriptures, adhered not to the Letter in their Translations, but, (p) as *St. Hilary*,

(o) *Basnage's History of the Jews*, Book III. Cap. 10. Sect. 15.

(p) Hi itaque seniores Libros suos transferentes & spir-italeni secundum Mosis Traditionem occultarum Cog-nitionum scientiam adepti, ambigua Linguae Hebraicae dicta & varia quadam ex se nunciantia, secundum vir-tutes Rerum, certis & propriis verborum significationi-bus transtulerunt Doctrinae scientia multimodam illam sermonum Intelligentiam temperantes. In Pf. 2. Sect. 2.

(q) *St.*

(q) St. *Augustin*, and (r) St. *Jerome* say, like *Expositors* more than *Translators*, had regard to the spiritual Signification, rather than to the Words of the Text; expressing many Prophecies more clearly, in the Opinion of the (s) *Jews*, than was done in the *Hebrew* Text. And where the *Hebrew* and *Greek* Text seem now widely to differ, they both, as (t) St. *Jerome* and (u) St. *Augustin* intimate, are for all that of Divine Authority, and will receive a true Sense and Completion under the Dispensation of the Gospel. Which Opinion of the Fathers will account for the multitude of Differences between the *Hebrew* and the *Greek* Text; will untie that Knot, which has puzzled the *Divines* of these last Ages, and restore the Version of the LXX to that Authority, with which it was entertain'd antiently by the *Jews* and Christians, who

(q) Non Interpretationis servitute sed Prophetiæ Auctoritate. In *Quæst.* 169. in *Pentateuch*.

(r) Septuaginta Interpretibus sensum potius quam verbum de verbo exprimentibus. In *Epist. ad Damas.*

(s) *Basnage's* Histor. p. 368.

(t) Multum LXX. Editio ad Hebraica veritate discordat, sed utraque habet suum sensum. In *Jeremiam*. Cap. 2.

(u) Merito enim creduntur LXX Interpretes accepisse propheticum spiritum, ut si quid ejus Auctoritate mutarent, atque aliter quam erat, quod interprebantur dicerent, neque hoc divinitus dictum dubitaretur. *De Civit Dei*, Lib. XV. Cap. 23.

both look'd on it as of Divine Inspiration; and by the Providence of God so order'd for the preparation of the World for the Reception of the Messiah. I could myself give some Instances of a seemingly wide Difference between the *Greek* and *Hebrew* Text, and shew how both have their true Sense and Completion, but this would take me too far out of my Way at present. However, all this is worthy of Consideration, and may serve not only as an Answer to the furious and injudicious (w) Cavils of Dr. *Lightfoot* and Dr. *Hare*, and others, against the Version of the LXX; but may prevent Mr. *Whiston's* Trouble of giving us a more *corrupt*, instead of a more *correct* Bible. For the *Hebrew* Text is no more corrupt, than the Version of the LXX is false and erroneous. The Light of the Spirit of Prophecy, when it shall shine upon the Old Testament, will dissipate all Mists of Obscurities, Difficulties, and Differences of both *Hebrew* and *Greek* Text. If there be some Corruptions crept into both Texts, which is not improbable by the frequency of Transcriptions, and other Means, yet the Art of Interpretation of Oracles, in the Times of the Spiri-

(w) *Discourse of the Grounds*, p. 179, 180.

tual Messiah, or Divine *Logos* of the Law and Prophets, of whose Office it is to solve (x) Ambiguities, &c. will rectify and set all strait. For the same Providence of God, who gave forth the Divine *Oracles*, and superintended their Translation into *Greek*, has guarded, and since watch'd over them, against all but *such* Corruptions, that at the Light of the Divine *Logos* will vanish, as does the Darkness of the Night at the Rising Sun.

Taking it then for granted (without more multiplication of Testimonies, which would swell this Discourse to too great a Bulk) that the antient *Jews* believed the Law and the Prophets to be Typical and Prophetical of the Life and Kingdom of their *Messias*; I shall now only (for a particular End in View) give you one of their Opinions concerning him. As it was their constant traditional Sense, that the Prophecy of *Deutr. xviii. 15, 18, 19.* referr'd to the *Messias*, so they concluded from it, that He would be a Prophet like unto *Moses* in all, and every Part of his Oeconomy. Dr. *Allix* (y) relates this to have been their Opinion, and how nothing was done by *Moses*, in the Deliverance of

(x) See the Discourse of the Grounds, p. 58, 76.

(y) Judgment of the *Jewish* Church, p. 22.

the *Israelites*, that would not be done over again by the *Messiah*, for the Redemption of his People. *Simeon Joachides*, (2) the famous *Cabalist*, was certainly of this Opinion. *Christianus Meyer*, a late *Jewish* Convert to Christianity, says, (a) it is most notorious, that all the more learned *Jews* held, that *Moses*, the first Saviour of *Israel*, was in his whole Life, and in all his Works, but a Type and Figure of the *Messias*, who was to be the last Redeemer. *St. Jerome*, who had better Opportunities to know the Opinions of the antient *Jews*, than any modern Writers have, says, (b) that they expected under their *Messias*, a Deliverance like to the old *Egyptian* one; and that like as *Pharaoh* and his Armies, who were for keeping the *Israelites* in Bondage, were overthrown in the *Red Sea*, so the *Romans*, who in like manner oppress'd them again, would be likewise destroy'd

(2) *Basnage's History of the Jews*, Book IV. Ch. 26.

(a) Doctoribus inter *Judæos* notissimum est — quod *Moses*, qui primus fuit *Salvator Israelis*, etiam in omni Vita & operibus suis fuerit *Typus & Figura ultimi Redemptoris*. *De Gen. Christi*. p. 145.

(b) *Judæi veteres* expectabant similem *Ægyptiacæ Liberationem* ut scilicet *Pharoah & omnis ejus Exercitus*, qui per 430 Annos *Populum dei captivum tenuit*, in *Mari Rubro* submersus est; sic etiam *Romani*, qui eodem Annorum Numero *Judæos possessori*, ultioris *Dominij deleantur*. *In Joëlis*, Cap. 3.

too. Which Opinion is to be met with repeatedly in *Pirke Eliezer*, (c) who plainly intimates, that God would again deliver his People from under the Empire of *Rome*, as he had done before out of *Egypt*.

The Inference that I make from all this is, that the only way of proving against the *Jews*, the *Messiahship* of our *Jesus*, is from his Completion of the Prophecies that went before of him. If the Truth of his Gospel can't be demonstrated by its Harmony to the Law of *Moses*, and the Divine Authority of the New Testament, by its Correspondence to the Old, we must give up the Cause of Christianity to them. It is absurd and unreasonable to expect the Conversion of the *Jews*, or their Belief of our *Jesus's* being the *Messiah* promised under the Law, if we can't show how He is, in their Opinion of the Scriptures, the End and Completion of them. What if the *Jews*, or the Author of the Discourse, &c. or any one else, like a *Celsus*, in the Name of the *Jews*, should take up the Objection against us, and say, "It was the Opinion of all our *Ancestors*, that the Law and the Prophets were entirely

(c) Merito sanguinis Paschatis liberavi vos ex Ægypto, merito quoque illius liberaturus sum Vos sub finem Regni quarti. Cap. 29.

“ Typical and Prophetical of the King-
 “ dom of the *Messiah*, to which Opinion
 “ we adhere; and therefore, since it does
 “ not appear that your *Jesus*, either in a
 “ literal or allegorical Sense, fulfill’d all,
 “ or any of their Prophecies, we reject
 “ him, and persist in our Unbelief, till
 “ you have clearly proved to our Under-
 “ standings, how he was the Completion
 “ of them. Your *Jesus*, indeed, like a
 “ true *Messias*, pretended to come to fulfil
 “ all Things that were written in the Law
 “ and the Prophets concerning him; but
 “ for as much as he made it not out how
 “ he fulfill’d them, He is but the greater
 “ *Deceiver* for that vain Pretence. And
 “ you the Disciples of your false *Messiah*,
 “ have, through all Ages of your Church,
 “ been talking of Types and Prophecies
 “ of him; but it is in such a dark, ob-
 “ scure, and confused Manner, that no
 “ Man of Sense can discern the Relation
 “ of the *Antitype* to the *Type*, or of the
 “ *Completion* to the *Prophecy*. Neither is
 “ there so much as one of the several scat-
 “ ter’d Prophecies that you pick up here
 “ and there out of the Scriptures, which,
 “ as apply’d to your *Jesus*, we can’t make
 “ just Exception against. Nay, those ve-
 “ ry few abrupt propheticall Sentences, that
 “ are cited and referr’d to by your *Evan-*
 “ *gelists*,

“ *gelists*, are liable to Objection ; and a-
 “ mong your selves do you cavil, and are
 “ divided about the Propriety, Authority,
 “ and Application of them. Moreover, It
 “ was antiently, and is still our (*d*) Opini-
 “ on, that *God in the Days of the Messias*
 “ *would so reveal himself, the Veil of the*
 “ *Letter of the Law and the Prophets be-*
 “ *ing done away, that we should see him*
 “ *Face to Face, when all the true Israelites*
 “ *would see Visions, and be endued with the*
 “ *Spirit of Prophecy* : But this is so far
 “ from coming to pass under your *Jesus*,
 “ and pretended *Messias*, that not only we
 “ *Jews* persist in our disbelief, but *Chri-*
 “ *stians* themselves, for want of this Vision,
 “ turn *Infidels*. Being press’d with this
 “ Objection against the Messiahship of
 “ your *Jesus*, you fly, forsooth, for Re-
 “ fuge, to the Power of his Miracles, which
 “ has nothing to do in this Controversy.
 “ Though Miracles bespeak a supernatural
 “ Power, yet a Man may be nothing the-
 “ more a Messiah for them ; which upon

(*d*) Quod se Deus (sub Messia) ita Israelitis revelabit,
 ut eum de facie ad faciem videre possint, ut scribitur, &
 revelabitur Gloria Domini, & videbit omnis Caro pari-
 ter, quod Os Domini locutum est, immo omnes in Populo
 Israel Prophetas reddet, uti dicitur, & posthac effundam
 de spiritu meo super omnem Carnem. *Apud Buxtorf. Sy-*
nag. Judaic. Cap. 50.

“ the Testimony of *Moses*, and of your
 “ *Jesus*, may be wrought by a *false*, as
 “ well as by a *true* Prophet. If the *Mes-*
 “ *siab* is to be proved by his Miracles, it
 “ must be by such Signs and Wonders that
 “ *Moses* before wrought for the Delive-
 “ rance of God’s People, or he is not the
 “ Prophet like *Moses*, according to the
 “ Opinion and Tradition of our Fore-
 “ fathers. Our Ancestors indeed did seem
 “ to believe, that the *Messiah* was to be
 “ born about the Time that your *Jesus*
 “ was, and then to deliver his People from
 “ *Roman* Servitude, after the manner that
 “ *Moses* deliver’d the *Israelites* of old from
 “ *Egyptian* Bondage. If your *Jesus* had
 “ been such a Saviour and Redeemer of
 “ his Church, as was *Moses*, by the like
 “ Signs and Wonders, we must have be-
 “ liev’d in him. But since no such Pro-
 “ phet and Redeemer, as was *Moses*, did
 “ then arise, we adjourn our Expectations
 “ of the *Messiah*, till toward the latter
 “ End of Six (e) thousand Years of the
 “ Creation, when it is hoped he will come
 “ and manifest himself by a plain Com-
 “ pletion, and clear Illustration of the Pro-
 “ phecies concerning him. In the mean

(e) See *Basnage’s History of the Jews*, Book IV. Chap. 20.

“ Time we absolutely reject your *Jesus*
 “ for a false *Messiah*, because he is no Ful-
 “ filler of the Law and the Prophets, in
 “ the Sense of our Fore-fathers; neither
 “ is he a Prophet like *Moses*, in mighty
 “ Signs and Wonders, notwithstanding that
 “ the Fathers of your Church did often so
 “ speak of him.

This is a potent Objection, and I know
 not how to answer it, but by shewing how
 our *Jesus* has fulfill'd, and will fulfil, the
 Types and Prophecies of the Old Testa-
 ment concerning him. This we must do,
 or yield up our Religion to the *Jews*. It
 is Nonsense to talk of the Excellency of
 Christ's Doctrine, and of the Power of his
 Miracles, if the *Jews* insist upon a Proof
 of his *Messiahship* from Prophecy. There-
 fore I look upon it as a good Reason, why
 the Affirmative of the *Question* in Debate
 ought to be maintain'd; *because the anti-*
ent Jews believ'd the Law and the Prophets
to be Typical and Prophetical of the Life,
Reign, and Kingdom of the Messiah; con-
sequently Christians are to prove their Jesus
to have fulfill'd the Law and the Prophets
accordingly, or they can't evince him to be
the Messiah to the Jews, nor expect their
Conversion to Christianity, if they insist on
their old Principles, and make the Objecti-

on aforesaid. But what adds yet more Force to this *Reason*, is the

III. *Third Reason*, why the Affirmative of the Question in Debate, ought to be defended by Christians ; and that is, *Because the Apostles and Fathers of the Church, being of the same Opinion with the Jews above, believ'd the Old Testament to be prophetical entirely of the New ; and that our Jesus, under the Dispensation of the Gospel, did and would fulfil all Things that were written in the Law and the Prophets, which they labour'd to prove for their Time : Therefore it behoves Christians to persist in, and clear up that Proof, or give up their Apostles and Fathers of the Church for Sons of Error, Believers in a false Messiah, or at least for Entertainers of wrong Conceptions concerning our Jesus.*

There was a wonderful Harmony of Opinion between the old *Jews* and the *Apostles and Fathers* of the Church, about the Scriptures of the Old Testament, and the way of Interpretation of them. As the one look'd on those Holy Writings to be prophetical of a Messiah to come ; so the other no less esteem'd them as Prophecies of our Jesus, whom they believ'd to be the expected Messiah, and Fulfiller of them.

them. And the Christians as well as the *Jews*, agreed in the mystical and allegorical Interpretation of the Law and the Prophets, as the only way to find out the prophetical Sense and Impletion of them. And both admitted of the Maxim (f) of *St. Paul*, that all *Things had happen'd to their Forefathers in Types and Figures*. The Difference then, as the *Author of the Discourse*, &c. (g) rightly observes, between the Primitive Christians and the *Jews*, lay not in different Opinions about the Oracles of the Old Testament, nor about the way of Interpretation of them, but in the *Application* of the Prophecies to our *Jesus*; which the unbelieving *Jews* not apprehending, the Fathers of the Church endeavour'd more and more to illustrate to their Understandings, in order to the Conversion of them.

That the Apostles and Fathers of the Church, held all the Writings of *Moses* and the Prophets to be, in a mystical Sense, prophetical of *Jesus* and his Gospel, is a Thing so notorious, that there would be no need to bring Proofs of it, if the Apostacy of the Age we live in, the Clergy's Ignorance of the Fathers, and their Per-

(f) *Basnage's History of the Jews*, Lib. IV. Ch. 25.
 (g) Page 169.

version of Apostolical Expressions to a contrary and most uncouth Sense, did not make it necessary. What can St. Paul mean, when he says, *Heb. x. 1. The Law is a Shadow of good Things to come, and not the very Image of the Things*; and when he speaks of a *Veil upon Mens Hearts*, *2 Cor. iii. 14, 15. in the Reading of the Old Testament, which Veil is done away in Christ*; and when, speaking of the *Israelites Deliverance out of Egypt*, *1 Cor. x. 1, 2, &c.* and of their Peregrinations in the Wilderness, of the Manna they eat, and the Water of the Rock they drank, of their Idolatry, Murmurings, and Temptations, &c. he says, *All these Things are our Types, happen'd to them for Ensamples, and are written for our Admonition*; and when, speaking of the Tabernacle Moses made, *Heb. viii. 5.* he doth intimate, that all Things of it were made after the Evangelical Pattern shewn to him in the Mount; and when, speaking of the *Jewish Meats and Drinks, and Holidays, New-Moons, and Sabbath Days*, *Col. ii. 16, 17.* he says, *They were a Shadow of Things to come, and the Body of the Law was of Christ*; and when, speaking of the Priesthood under the Law, with their Gifts and Sacrifices, *Heb. viii. 4, 5.* he says, they serv'd but as *Types and Shadows of an Evangelical Priest-*

Priesthood, who are *Ministers of the New Testament*, 2 Cor. iii. 6. *not of the Letter of the Law, but of the Spirit of it?* What, I say, could St. Paul mean by these, and many more such like Passages in his Epistles, but that he look'd upon the whole Law and the Prophets to be typical and prophetical of the Gospel of our *Jesus*, and that the New Testament consisted in the Spiritual Interpretation, Completion, and Revelation of the Old? There is no one would question this to have been St. Paul's Meaning, if such an Harmony, as he intimates, between the Law and the Gospel, the *Old* and *New* Testament, could be made clear to the Understanding of Man. And though Commentators, now-a-Days, for want of such a visible Harmony between the Two Testaments, which they are not apprehensive of, do put a different Gloss on St. Paul's Expressions above, yet the great Mr. Dodwell (b) was of Opinion that such Apostolical Reasonings imply'd, *That all Things recorded of the Israelites in the Old Testament, were Type and Prophecy of what would come to pass under the New.* And our present most

(b) Omnia ab illis Hebræis gesta in Sacris Litteris memorata pro Prophetiis habent Novi Testamenti Ratiocinia. *Apud Grab. Spicil. Patr. Sect. Prim. p. 339.*

Reverend and Learned Archbishop of Canterbury is of Opinion, that such Citations out of *St. Paul*, are a sufficient (i) *Vindication* or *Apology* for the allegorical Interpretation of the Law and the Prophets. Whereupon, to do the *Author of the Discourse*, &c. Justice, we must own, he rightly inferr'd from such like Apostolical Passages above, that *Christianity is founded on the Judaism of the Old Testament*, which is mystically to be expounded for the Proof of it.

But whatever may be the Opinion of the generality of Commentators of this Age, on the foresaid Apostolical Texts, which they almost altogether put another Construction upon, than what the present *Archbishop of Canterbury*, *Mr. Dodwel*, the *Author of the Discourse*, &c. and my self understand them in; yet the Fathers of the Church had the same Notion of them which we have, and which the Words at first Sight seem to bear. I have before hinted what the Fathers thought of the Sayings of our Saviour, above quoted; as how they coucluded from them, that no less could be understood, than that the Law and the Prophets were entirely typical

(i) Of the Catholick Epistle of *St. Barnabas*, Sect. 35.
and

and prophetical of himself, and his Church. The like Opinion they had of these Apostolical Expressions before us. It is frequently, very frequently, that they, such as *Origen*, *St. Augustin*, *St. Jerome*, *St. Cyril of Alexandria*, and others, in their mystical and allegorical, that is, prophetical Expositions of the *Old Testament*, do refer to one or other of the foresaid Passages in *St. Paul*, as their Authority and Justification of their Endeavours mystically to interpret. He must be very ignorant, and an absolute Stranger to the Fathers, who knows not this: And was I to go about to collect Passages in the Fathers to prove it, I know not when, for their great Numbers, I should come to an end of them. And in short, the Opinion of the Fathers for the *Old Testament's* consisting entirely of Types and Prophecies of our *Jesus*, and his Church, under the *New*, is so universal, that to produce ample Authorities out of their Writings to this Purpose, would be an Affront to the Learning of the Age, and reflect the greatest Shame upon the Clergy for Ignorance of any thing, except one, and that is, their literal Expositions of the Scriptures, contrary to the manifest and manifold Declarations, Prohibitions, Exhortations, Cautions, and Admonitions of the Fathers, who would

E give

give them sufficient Assistance and Light for the allegorical and prophetical Interpretation of the *Old Testament*, from the beginning to the end of it.

What (k) *Justin Martyr* says of the Law of *Moses*, that it consists of Types, Symbols, and Declarations of Things to come under our *Jesus*; and what *St. Jerome* (l) says of the Prophets (whether they write of *Egypt*, *Babylon*, *Moab*, *Ammon*, &c.) that *all* in a spiritual and figurative Sense will be fulfill'd, or transacted again under the Dispensation of the Gospel; and what *St. Augustin* (m) says of the whole *Jewish* Administration's being Prophecy of Christ and his Church, was the constant, common, and unvariable Opinion of the primitive Christians for many Ages.

Taking then this for granted, which no Man with the least Shadow of Authority

(k) Και τα αλλα παντα υπο Μωσως διαλαχθεντα δυναται αποδεικνυναι τυπους, και συμβολα και καταγγελιας των το χειρω γινεσθαι μελλοντων. In *Dialog.* p. 261.

(l) Post *Historiæ Veritatem* spiritualiter accipienda sunt omnia : & sic *Judæa* & *Jerusalem*, *Babylon* & *Philisthim*, *Moab* & *Damascus*, *Ægyptus* & *Desertum Mare*, *Idumæa* & *Arabia*, ac *Vallis Visionis* & ad extremum *Ty-rus* & *Vilio quadrupedum*, intelligenda sunt. In *Prolog.* in *Isai Comment.*

(m) *Judaicæ Reipublicæ* tota Administratio Prophetia est illius Regis Venturi, & Civitatem cælestem ex omnibus Gentibus condituri. *De Consens. Evang.* Lib. I. Sect. 17.

can deny, that the Apostles and Fathers of the Church believed the Old Testament to be entirely prophetical of the New; I shall now only speak to one Opinion of the Apostles and Fathers of the Church concerning our *Jesus*, in which they exactly agreed with the antient *Jews*, concerning their expected *Messias*. As it was the Opinion of the *Jews*, that the Prophecy of *Deut. xviii. 15, 18, 19.* referr'd to the *Messiah*, so it was the Opinion of the Fathers, that it pointed at our *Jesus*: Neither have any of the Church universal, before *Calvin*, *Grotius*, and *Stillfleet*, supposed it could aim at any other Prophet, or Succession of Prophets. As the *Jews* from that Prophecy, as you may see above, believed the *Messias* would be a Prophet like to *Moses*, in every Part of his Oeconomy, so the Fathers of the Church, as appears from (n) *Eusebius*, and others, thought our *Jesus* was, or would be in all Points like to him. As the *Jews* held their *Messias* would be a Saviour, like *Moses*, in the Work of the like Signs, Wonders, and Judgments, for the Deliverance of his People from Gentile Oppres-

(n) Εἰκότως περὸν ἐλεγον καὶ οὐδὲν ἀποδείκναι τῆς καὶ αὐτὸν οἰκονομίας. *Demonst. Evang. Lib. III. Cap. 2.*

fion; so the Fathers, as appears from (o) *Irenæus*, (p) *Origen*, (q) *Hilary*, and others, taught, that our *Jesus* wrought, like *Moses*, such Signs and Wonders for the Redemption of his Church. As (r) *Jesirah*, the ancient *Jew* says, the *Messias* would conduct his People through a *Spiritual Sea*, of which the Red Sea was a Figure; so St. Paul intimates, 1 Cor. x. 1. that that Sea which the old *Israelites* pass'd through, was but a Type of a spiritual one, that the Church was to be baptiz'd in. Lastly, as it was the Opinion of the *Jews*, that their *Messias* would come about the Time our *Jesus* arose, for the Subversion of the *Emperors*, and Empire of *Rome*, as *Pharaoh* and the *Egyptians* were before overthrown by *Moses*; so it was the Opinion of the Fathers, that the Hea-then *Emperors* of *Rome*, and the *Gentiles*,

(o) *Universa enim quæ ex Ægypto Profectio fiebat Populi a Deo Typus & Imago fuit Profectionis Ecclesiæ, quæ erat futura ex Gentibus. Lib IV, Cap. 50.*

(p) *Vid. Comment. in Exod.*

(q) *Ea quæ Libro Exodi inscripta sunt, Ægypti Plage, Pharaonis Pena secundum Apostolum, umbra sunt futurorum quæ in Lege gesta fuerunt, allegorimena sunt, non negligenter audienda, quia sub corporalium gestorum fide in Exemplum sunt spiritualium Operum constituta. In Ps. 134. Sect. 1.*

(r) *In prima Redemptione in hoc Mari materiali : in Redemptione ultima in Mari Legis spirituali. Apud Rit-sangel. p. 44.*

were

were destroy'd by our *Jesus*, and a (s) Deliverance of the Church effected after the like manner.

Thus was there a singular Harmony of Opinion between the Fathers of the Church, and the antient *Jews*, concerning the Old Testament's being altogether Prophecy of the Reign and Kingdom of the *Messias*; particularly concerning *Moses's* being a Type of the *Messias* in all Things. And what can we infer from this Opinion of the Fathers less, than that the *Affirmative* of the Question in Debate, ought to be maintain'd by Christians, or they must give up the Apostles and Fathers of the Church, for Believers in a false *Messias*, or at least for Entertainers of wrong Nations concerning our *Jesus*. The Apostles and Fathers of the Church for their Time, labour'd the Point hard in the Application of the Prophecies of the Old Testament to our *Jesus*; and perform'd much better in this Case, than could have been expected from them, if

(s) Totam Historiam exeuntium de Ægypto & pergentium ad Terram Sanctam, brevi sermone perstringens, etiam nunc Historiæ similitudinem conservaret. Sancti Hieron. in Oseam, c. 2. Vid. & Cyril. Alex. de Ador. Lib. 1. Gregor. Nazian. Orat. 20. & 42. Cyril. Hierosol. Catech. myst. 1. Sect. 2. Sanctum Augustin. cont. Faustum. L. 12. cum aliis.

they

they had not been endued with a more than ordinary Gift of the Interpretation of Oracles. And if they did not make the Point most clear to any Man's Capacity, that our Jesus was the *Messiah* from Prophecy, it was because they then *knew but in Part*, and could *prophecy but in Part*. A compleat Understanding of the Prophecies of the Old Testament, being reserv'd for that Perfection of Time, for whose Admonition and Instruction, the Types of the Law and the Prophets were written. It was impossible for the Apostles and Fathers of the Church of the three first Ages, to discern and prove clearly, so much as the similitude between *Moses* and our *Jesus*, in the Deliverance of his People; because the Redemption of the Church, according to the Type, was not then accomplish'd. And it is well known, according to (t) *Irenæus*, that *Prophecy*, before its Completion, is all *Ambiguity* and *Enigma*, hard to be understood and illustrated: And if the Christians of succeeding Times, made not this famous Vision clear upon the Tables of the Two Testa-

(t) Omnis Prophetia priusquam habeat Completionem, Ambiguitas & Enigma est; cum autem venerit Tempus & evenit quod prophetatum est, tunc Prophetia habebit liquidam Expositionem. *Lib. 4. c. 43.*

ments, it was because they were more careless of Vision, more and more deprived of the Gift of Interpretation, and apostatized from the Spirit of Prophecy. And whether that *Perfection (u) of Time* for the Illustration of Prophecy, which the Apostles and Fathers of the Church speak often of, be come or not, yet it is incumbent on Christians at this Day, to show an Harmony between the *Law* and the *Gospel*, the New Testament and the Old, and how our *Jesus* is the Fulfiller of the Law and the Prophets, or we can't demonstrate the Truth of Christianity to those who demand and insist on such a Proof of it.

What if some Infidel, as suppose the *Author of the Discourse, &c.* should take up the Objection, and say, "You Christians at this Day, are no more like to the Apostles and Fathers of the Church, in Principles, than an *Ethiopian* is to an *European* in Countenance. The Apostles and the Fathers held the *Old Testament* to consist of Types and Prophecies of the *New*; and that Tropes, and Metaphors, and Allegories, are to be made

(u) Cum autem venerit quod perfectum, tum & Velum Templi interius dirumpendum est, ut omnia quæ nunc nobis abscondita sunt, Domus Dei Sacramenta videamus. *Hieron. in Epist. ad Hedibriam.*

“ Use of in the Interpretation of the
 “ Scriptures, for the manifestation of the
 “ Harmony between the Two Testaments;
 “ but you are so far from this Opinion,
 “ that you literally interpret the Law and
 “ the Prophets, as if they had no prophetic
 “ Relation to Christ and his Church.
 “ You talk indeed of Prophecies in the
 “ Old Testament, but it is in another way
 “ than the Fathers ever dream’d of; nei-
 “ ther do you so much as speak of the
 “ *New* and *Old* Testament in the Sense
 “ which they did; who understood by the
 “ one, the (*w*) *Testament* of the *Letter* of
 “ the Law, and by the other the Testa-
 “ ment of the *Spirit* of it. If you would
 “ reconcile us to Christianity, you must
 “ prove it from Prophecy upon the Prin-
 “ ciples of the Fathers, whose Authority
 “ is more than *human*, or the Christian
 “ Religion has no good Foundation. In
 “ all this Time, considering the great Age
 “ of the Church, one might think you
 “ would have clear’d the Truth of the
 “ Gospel from Prophecy; but notwith-
 “ standing your numerous and voluminous
 “ Productions on the Law and the Pro-
 “ phets, we are still at a Loss for such a

(*w*) Duo Testamenta, quorum unum in Littera, alterum
 in Spiritu. *Hieron. in Quæst. 9. ad Algasiam.*

“ Proof. Supposing that Perfection of
 “ Time which the Apostles and Fathers
 “ talk of, be not come, for the Illustration
 “ of Prophecy, yet, reasonably speaking,
 “ you might have prophesied in a greater
 “ Measure than they did; and at least
 “ have made it appear, that *Jesus* is the
 “ Prophet like *Moses*, in the Redemption
 “ of his Church, if there had been any
 “ Truth in that famous and concurrent
 “ Opinion of both *Jews* and *Fathers*. If
 “ you had done this, we would have taken
 “ the rest of the Old Testament for Pro-
 “ phesy, upon the Word of the Fathers,
 “ and have trusted a while for the Inter-
 “ pretation and Understanding of it. But
 “ in as much as you have not done this,
 “ nor have explained any other Prophe-
 “ cies, which are not liable to Exceptions
 “ among your selves, as well as to Objec-
 “ tions from us; we persist in our Unbe-
 “ lief, and will be convinced, that *Jesus*
 “ is the *Messias*, by no other Argument
 “ than from Prophecy, according to the
 “ united Opinion of both *Jews* and Fa-
 “ thers.

This is another mighty Objection against
 us, and I wonder none, before the *Author*
 of the *Discourse*, &c. with his sly Insinua-
 tions, did ever make it; particularly I
 have wonder'd that none have objected

F

against

against the *Messiahship* of our *Jesus*, the Opinion of both *Jews* and *Fathers*, concerning his being a Prophet like *Moses*, in the *Deliverance* of his People. Such an Objection unanswer'd, overthrows *Christianity* at once, and renders the Authority of the *Antients* void and null. *Faustus*, the *Manichee*, who believ'd there was no Affinity between the *Old* and *New Testament*, did make the Objection, saying, that the (z) *Words* of *Deut. xviii, 15, &c.* could not relate to *Jesus*, because he was not a Prophet like *Moses*. Whether any one will think *St. Augustin's* Argumentation, that *Jesus* was the Antitype of *Moses* in all Things, a satisfactory Answer to *Faustus*, I know not : But the Objection may be so stated, that, without a clear Proof of *Moses's* being entirely a Type of *Jesus*, and of the Deliverance of the *Christian Church*, after the manner of the *Israelitish* out of *Egypt*, the Authority of the *Fathers* must be set at nought, and the Truth of our Religion yielded up to *Infidels*. Neither will any other Arguments for *Jesus's Messiahship*, whether taken from

(z) Verba Deuteron. xviii. 15. non posse de Christo intelligi, quia Christus Moyſi ſimilis non eſt. *Auguſt. cont. Fauſt. Lib. 16. c. 4.*

his Miracles or Doctrine, stand us in any
stead. Which brings me to the

IV. Fourth Reason, Why the Affirmative of the Question in Dispute, ought to be maintain'd by Christians, and that is, *Because no other Arguments, whether drawn from the Excellency of Christ's Doctrine, or Power of his Miracles, are of any Validity to prove his Divine Authority and Messiahship, if this from Prophecy, in the first Place, be not evinced, and clearly made out.*

The Writers against the Author of the Discourse, &c. being distress'd with the Subtilty of his Reasonings against Christianity, and of Inability to demonstrate the Messiahship of Jesus from Prophecy, do fly for Refuge to other Arguments for the Truth of their Religion, and are a little angry with him, for insisting so much on a Proof from Prophecy, when he might be convinced of Jesus's Divine Authority (whether it be proved from Prophecy or not) from the Excellency of his Doctrine, and Power of his Miracles: But notwithstanding this Opinion of the Writers against the Author of the Discourse, &c. there is no Sanctuary for them in the Doctrine and Miracles of Jesus, neither is

their Religion to be defended against him without Prophecy.

I know not what modern *Advocates* for the Truth of Christianity mean by the Excellency of the Doctrine of our *Jesus*, who taught all in *Parables*, *neither did he ever speak without a Parable*. Which *Parables* treated of *the Mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven*; that is, of the spiritual and sublime Sense of the Law and the Prophets, which they understand not: Neither are the *Parables* of *Jesus* to be understood, upon the Testimony of the Fathers, without the preceding allegorical and prophetical Interpretation of the Old Testament, which they are no less Enemies than Strangers to. If the Writers against the *Author of the Discourse*, &c. have any other Notion of the Excellency of Christ's Doctrine, as, for Instance, of his being an admirable Teacher of the Duties of Morality, I would by no means have them to speak it out, for fear the *Author of the Discourse*, &c. should laugh at them, and prove that any of the Philosophers of the *Gentiles*, or any other rational Man, may make a much better Teacher than *Jesus* was.

Neither do *Jesus* his Miracles, as they are now-a-days understood, make any Thing for his Authority and *Messiahship*.

It

It is admirably argued by the (y) *Author of the Discourse*, &c. saying, "If the Proofs for Christianity from the Old Testament be not valid; if the Arguments founded on those Proofs be not conclusive, and the Prophecies cited from thence be not fulfilled, then has Christianity no just Foundation: For the Foundation on which Jesus and his Apostles built it, is then invalid and false. Nor can Miracles, said to be wrought by Jesus and his Apostles, in behalf of Christianity, avail any thing in the Case: For Miracles can never render a Foundation valid, which is in it self invalid; can never make a false Inference true, can never make a Prophecy fulfill'd, which is not fulfill'd; and can never mark out a *Messias*, or *Jesus* for the *Messias*, if both are not mark'd out in the Old Testament. Besides, Miracles said to be wrought, may be often justly esteem'd false Reports, when attributed to Persons who claim an Authority from the Old Testament, which they impertinently alledge to support their Pretences. God can never be supposed often to permit Miracles to be done for

“ the Confirmation of a false and pre-
 “ tended Mission; and if at any Time he
 “ does permit Miracles to be wrought in
 “ Confirmation of a pretended Mission,
 “ we have Directions from the Old (z) Te-
 “ stament, not to regard such Miracles,
 “ but are to continue firm to the antece-
 “ dent Revelation confirm’d by Miracles,
 “ and contain’d in the Old Testament,
 “ notwithstanding any Miracles which
 “ (in the Opinion of some Divines, as
 “ (a) *splendid Gifts as they are, are no*
 “ *Demonstration of the Truth*, but) under
 “ the Circumstance of attesting some-
 “ thing contrary to an antecedent Revela-
 “ tion confirm’d by Miracles, are certainly
 “ no Proofs of the Truth. This is admi-
 rably reason’d! and I wish the Writers
 against the *Author of the Discourse*, &c.
 would lay it to Heart, and consider, whe-
 ther *Jesus* for his Miracles, can be any
 thing the more a *Messiah*. Do his Mira-
 cles prove him to be the Fulfiller of the
 Law and the Prophets, or that the Old
 Testament consisted of Prophecies of him?
 No certainly. His being the *Messias*, must
 be proved from Prophecy, in the first

(z) Deut. xiii. 1, 2.

(a) *Hicks's Apol. Vind. of the Church of England.*
 P. 23, 24.

Place; or Miracles and the Truth of them are foreign to the Purpose. *Jesus* himself, as well as *Moses*, says, false Prophets and false Christs may do Miracles, and (b) work Wonders to the deception of Mankind: And it's enough to make us take *Jesus* himself upon Suspicion for a false *Messias*, notwithstanding his Miracles, for pretending to fulfil the Law and the Prophets to a Tittle, when there is little or nothing at all that is clearly proved, or can be plainly discern'd to be fulfill'd by him. And tho' the *Bishop of Litchfield*, in a long Harangue upon the Miracles of our Saviour, thinks he has answer'd the *Author of the Grounds's* foresaid Passage, and Argument (which, by the by, he has wilfully (c) maim'd, or more modestly speaking, has imperfectly represented, by leaving out that choice Saying of *Dr. Hicks*) yet I am of a contrary Opinion, and think he hardly apprehends the Force of it.

Dr. Hicks, as above, says, That *Miracles, as splendid Gifts as they are, are no Demonstrations of the Truth*; much less are our *Jesus's* wonderful Works, as they are commonly understood, a Proof of his *Messiahship*: For was I to take them into

(b) Matth. xxiv. 24.

(c) His Defence of Christianity, p. 417.

strict Examination, I could reduce them to next to nothing. I could say much, not only in diminution of that Power they were wrought by, but enough to make us nauseate the Report of some of them, as done by an immensely wise Prophet. St. *Irenæus* says, (d) *If Jesus's Power of healing the Diseased was only temporal, there was nothing grand in it*; that is, if that Power was not of some farther Use, and spiritual Signification, we ought not to wonder at it. *Celsus* rightly objects against *Jesus*, his Allowance, that false Christs may do the like, or as great Miracles; and how then, says he, (e) *Shall we know or distinguish the God from the Deceiver by them?* And St. *Augustin* says, that some of the Works of *Jesus* were foolish ones, if not figurative. And was he now alive, I believe he would expose to Ridicule all, or most of the Miracles of our Saviour, upon the Sense modern Commentators take them in, as well as he has done that of his (f) *Cur-sing the Fig-tree*. If I understand St. *Augustin* aright, he allows, what Infidels did ob-

(d) Si enim temporalis erat ab eo utilitas, nihil grande præstitit iis, qui ab eo curati sunt. *Lib. V. Cap. 12. Sect. 6.*

(e) Ουχέλαιον ὑπο τῶν αὐτῶν ἐργῶν τὸν μὲν Θεὸν, τοὺς δὲ γνῆτας η̅γνιδαι. *Cont. Celsum. Lib. II. p. 89.*

(f) Hoc factum, nisi figuratum accipiatur, stultum invenitur. *Serm. 77. Sect. 7.*

ject, that Jesus's Miracles (abstracted from their mystical Signification) might be wrought by (g) *magick Art and Power*. And what is the Reason that St. *Augustin*, in Compliance with Infidels, runs down the Miracles of *Jesus*? To exalt the Proof of his Messiahship from Prophecy, as the only sure and certain one that can be trusted to, and depended on, and which the *Author of the Discourse* will allow to be most sure and *demonstrative*.

I have no Inclination to take the Miracles of our Jesus into Examination, and expose them in Fact, or in Circumstance, for no strange and extraordinary Things, which I could do; and show, that even the best circumstantiated of them would, as St. *Augustin* (b) argues, never have been wrought, but for some mystical Ends and Purposes. But I believe this will be done

(g) Ut enim non contemnerentur, neque fabulosa dicerentur quæ Apostoli annunciabant, demonstrabantur hæc a Prophetis ante fuisse prædicta: quia etsi attestabantur Miracula, non defuissent (sicut etiam nunc quidam mustitant) qui magicæ Potentiæ cuncta illa tribuerent, nisi talis eorum Cogitatio Contestatione prophetica vinceretur. *Cōnt. Faust. Lib. XII. Cap. 45.*

(b) Dominus noster ea quæ faciebat corporaliter, etiam spiritualiter volebat intelligi. Neque enim miracula propter miracula faciebat, sed ut illa quæ faciebat, mira essent videntibus, vera essent intelligentibus. *Serm. 98. Sess. 3.*

sometime for the Service of the Cause, and Question in Hand. Nay, that Grand Miracle of *Christ's* Resurrection from the Dead, which one of the Writers against the *Author of the Discourse*, &c. thinks a sufficient Foundation in it self, to build the Church on, may be call'd into Question. Don't we know that the *Jews*, the Crucifiers of Jesus, said, "*His Disciples came by Night and stole his Body away whilst the Guards slept, which is commonly reported among the Jews at this Day.* Neither is it any more incredible, that the Disciples should enter upon such a Project, to prevent the Shame of believing in a false Prophet, than it was improbable that the Guards should be fast asleep, upon keeping such a *Gaudy Day*, as was the Feast of the *Passover*. *Noon-Day* had been more proper for the Display of a real Resurrection, but *Mid-night* better serv'd the Purpose of the Disciples. But the Objection of *Celsus* against *Christ's* Resurrection, was never as yet well answer'd; that is, because (i) that *Jesus*, after he was risen, appear'd not to all the People, to

(i) Si Jesus volebat revera declarare suam divinam Potentiam, debuerat suis Insultatoribus, ipsique Præfidi, qui capitalem sententiam contra se tulerat, deinde cæteris omnibus se ostendere. *Orig. cont. Cels. Lib. II. p. 98.*

“ the Shame and Confusion of his Murde-
 “ rers, but only to *some chosen Witnesses*,
 “ that is, choice Confederates and Accom-
 “ plices, who were resolv’d, &c. It was not
 “ till (k) *three Days* after Christ’s Passion,
 “ that the *Jews* expected his Resurrection,
 “ when in all probability the People would
 “ be gathered together to behold the Mira-
 “ cle; but the Disciples were a Day or two
 “ before-hand with the Expectations of the
 “ People. And tho’ the Disciples, for ought
 “ we know, might be simple and undesign-
 “ ing Men, yet there have been such in the
 “ World, who, to serve a Purpose, would
 “ not stick to devise and propagate a Fal-
 “ shood, and at the Hazard of their Lives
 “ stand to it. But however this be, the Sto-
 “ ry of *Jesus’s* Prediction, that he was to
 “ lay *three Days and three Nights in the*
 “ *Heart of the Earth*; that is, from our
 “ *Friday Night*, to *Sunday Morning* before
 “ break of Day, otherwise call’d *one Day*,
 “ *and one Night and a half*, was so ill
 “ concerted by the *Evangelists*, as if they
 “ wanted good Memories, and common Un-
 “ derstandings, that it is a Temptation to
 “ any one to think the whole but a *Fable*,
 “ and that too no *cunningly devised* one.

(k) Matth. xxvii. vers. 63.

“ The cunningest Part of the Project, or
 “ the best Piece of Management, in my
 “ Opinion, though the *Author of the Dis-*
 “ *course*, &c. seems to think otherwise, was
 “ the (l) employing of *Women* to prepare
 “ Perfume for Christ's Body against the
 “ Stench of Corruption, and the sending
 “ them before Day to the Sepulchre;
 “ where, being surprized with the loss of
 “ his Body, and astonish'd at the Voice of
 “ *two Men*, there planted like *Ghosts* and
 “ *Apparitions*, saying, *he is not here, but*
 “ *is risen*, could think of nothing less than
 “ a stupendous Miracle; which they would
 “ be sure to publish with such Improve-
 “ ments, as their feminine Transports and
 “ Credulity suggested, and most seriously
 “ vouch for the Truth of it.” Thus could
 I almost reason my self into a Disbelief of
 Christ's Resurrection; and was I not convin-
 ced that the whole Story, in which there
 is no Sense according to the Letter, was
 but a (m) Type and Figure of his spiritual
 and mystical Death and Resurrection out

(l) Page 255.

(m) Et nunc novi sacerdotum Principes Verbum Veritatis positum in scripturis crucifigunt falsis Expositionibus & occidunt Mendaciis *Origen in Matth. cap. 27.* Monumentum Christi est divina Scriptura, in qua Divinitatis & Humanitatis ejus Mytheria Densitate Litteræ veluti quadam muniuntur Petra. *Id. Hom. 2. In Divers.*

of the Grave of the *Letter* of the Law and the Prophets, in which he has been buried, or swallow'd up, as by a *Leviathan* like *Jonah*, for above three mystical Days and Nights, I should believe it to be but an *idle Tale*, as the Apostles themselves did, upon the Report which the Women made of it. But after all, I believe upon good (n) Authority, some of the Miracles of Jesus, as recorded by the Evangelists, were never wrought, but only related as prophetical and parabolical Narratives of what will be mysteriously and more wonderfully done by him.

The Resurrection of Christ then, which wants a good Proof of it self, proves nothing, much less do his other Miracles prove him to be the Messias: Or, as the *Author of the Discourse, &c.* says, (o) *Miracles wrought by Jesus are, according to the Gospel Scheme, no absolute Proofs of his being the Messias, or of the Truth of Christianity.* It is true that Jesus, *John x. 28.* appeals to his Works, as a Proof of his Authority, but he must mean to the mystical Sense of them, or they do not

(n) Veritas Scripturæ tradentis nobis Gesta Jesu non consistit in nudis Verbis Historiæ, nam in unoquoque significatur latens aliquid, &c. *Origen. cont. Cels. Lib. II.*

(o) Page 27.

prove him to be a Prophet endued with the Wisdom, as well as the Power of the Father, who was in him. For as *Jesus* himself, and *St. Paul* say, that false Christs, and the *Antichrist* shall work Signs and Wonders, to the deception of Mankind; so (p) *Origen*, and (q) *Hippolitus*, and other Fathers assert, that *Antichrist* will be an Imitator of *Jesus* in all his Miracles. I longer wonder'd at this Opinion of the Fathers, than at any Thing else I ever met with in their Writings: But when I consider'd that, according to the Fathers, there were as many *Antichrists* as there are *Heresies*, with their *Lo here is Christ*, and *Lo there he is*, my Wonder ceas'd: And I soon found that the great *Antichrist*, according to *St. Paul*, (r) *Ignatius*, (s) *St. Ambrose*, (t) *St. Jerome*, and others, was the *ανομη*, that is, the *Adversary* to the Spirituality of the Law and the Prophets; the Mystery of whose *ανομιας*, or Anti-

(p) *Contra Celsum, Lib. II.*

(q) *De Consummatione Mundi.*

(r) *Εἰ τις παυλίζει τον νομον η τους προφητας, ους ο χριστος επαληρωσεν, εσο ουι ως Αντιχριστος.* In *Epist. ad Heron.* Cap. 2.

(s) *Lex Dei spiritalis est, non habent veram Legem, qui eam non acceperint spiritaliter.* In *Pf. 118. Sect. 26.*

(t) *Per Ignorantiam Spiritualis Legis suscipitur Antichristus pro Christo.* In *Jerom. Cap. 9.*

christianism,

christianism, consisted in his Apostacy from, Enmity to, and Contempt of the Spirit of Prophecy that is in the Old Testament. The Clergy of this Day had best to look to it, whether they don't adhere to such a *false Christ*, instead of the true *Messiah*, or *Logos* of the Law: and whether, by their literal understanding of the *Miracles* of our *Jesus*, they may not have *changed* them into the *Wonders* of *that* false Prophet, whom the Lord, at his coming upon the Clouds of the Letter of the Law and the Prophets, will destroy with the Breath of his Mouth, or with the Spirit of Prophecy. The Clergy, I say, *had best to see to it, whether they have not chang'd the Miracles of Jesus into the Wonders of Antichrist*: For the whole Mystery of Christianity and Antichristianism is only intelligible in and through Jesus's Transfiguration, which, as *Gregory (u) Nazianzen* says, will be the grand Subject of the Contemplation of *Mystics*, who, upon the holy Mount of the Law, will intellectually behold how Jesus passes from one Type and Figure to another, and will apprehensively hear *Moses* and *Elias* reasoning with Divine *Logos*, about the Harmony and

(u) Το μελλον των μυσαγων. Orat. 35.

Agreement between the Law and the Gospel.

What then is the Consequence of all this, but that Christianity being, as the *Author of the Discourse*, &c. truly says, (w) *destitute of all other, or external Arguments*, we should turn our Heads and our Hearts to the alone Consideration of *Prophecies fulfill'd*, which he rightly calls (x) *the most proper of all Arguments*, to evince the Truth of our Religion. St. Peter, who convers'd with our Lord, and saw the Miracles he wrought, and heard the Voice from the *excellent Glory*, at his Transfiguration, saying, *This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased*; yet declares, that the *Word of Prophecy*, or Voice of God, speaking out of the Clouds of the Law and the Prophets, would be a (y) *more sure and indisputable Testimony of Jesus's Messiahship*. And wherefore did St. Peter say so? Because, as St. *Augustin* (z) rightly argues,

(w) Page 31.

(x) Page 29.

(y) 2 Pet. i. 19.

(z) Quis enim nostrum non miretur delata Voce de Cælo certio rem propheticum sermonem ab Apostolo dictum esse? quia possent Infideles istam Vocem delatam de Cælo per Conjecturas humanas & illicitas Curiositates ad magicas Artes referre. *Serm. 43. Sæc. 5.*

the Report of that Voice which he with others heard, and of *Jesus's* other Miracles, is liable to the Cavils, Exceptions, and Evasions of *Infidels*; but against antecedent Prophecy, and its subsequent Completion, there lies none, even in the Opinion of the *Author of the Discourse*, &c. who says, that (a) a Man who has the Old Testament put into his Hands, which contains Prophecies, and the New Testament, which contains their Completions, and is once satisfied, as he may be with the greatest ease, that the Old Testament existed before the New, may have a compleat, internal, and divine Demonstration of the Truth of Christianity; whereas Arguments of another Nature are very precarious. And I believe the *Author of the Discourse* to be herein so serious, that if considerable Prophecies, with their Completions under the Gospel, could clearly be produced, he would subscribe to the Truth of our Religion: In the mean time, if he persist in Infidelity, I can't much blame him.

And thus, for *Four* substantial Reasons, have I proved that the *Affirmative* of the Question in Debate, ought to be defended by Christians, viz. That the Law and the

(a) Page 29.

Prophets are entirely typical and prophetic of Christ and his Church, and that it is impossible to prove the Truth of Christianity, or our Jesus to be the Messiah, any otherwise than by showing how he does and will fulfil the Prophecies of him in the Old Testament. It is the Exhortation of the Holy Jesus himself, to search the Scriptures for Testimonies of his Authority and Messiahship, for they are they which testify of him. And St. Paul, (b) as his manner was, reason'd with the Jews only out of the Scriptures, opening them, and alledging, that this Jesus whom he preach'd was the Christ, or Messiah. And Apollos, tho' he was (c) an eloquent Man, yet had not Recourse to Rhetorical Harangues, and Dialectical Subtilties of pretended Ratiocination and Argumentation, that are alone in Use now-a-Days, but being mighty in the Scriptures, he mightily convinced the Jews, and that publickly, shewing by the Scriptures of the Old Testament, that Jesus was the Christ. And so must we too reason out of the Scriptures, if we mean to make Converts of either *Jews* or *Infidels*; for the Testimony of Jesus's Messiahship, says (d)

(b) Acts xvii. 2, 3.

(c) Acts xviii. 24, 28.

(d) Revel. xix. 10.

St. John, is the Spirit of Prophecy in the Old Testament ; neither can any Man say or prove, says (e) *St. Paul*, *Jesus to be the Lord, and Messiah*, but *by the Holy Spirit* of the Law and the Prophets. Whereupon give me Leave to say freely, that the Church must not pretend to have found or proved our *Jesus* to be the *Messiah*, till she can say with the Woman of *Samaria*, (who, according to (f) *St. Augustin*, and others, was a Type of the Heretical and Apostatical Church at this Day, or the whole Story of *Jesus's* Conversation with her, is the most foolish that ever was told of a wise Man with a simple Woman) that our *Jesus* has told her all she has been doing for many Ages past, by the Spirit, or according to the Predictions of the Law and the Prophets. Then, and not till then, may she appeal to the *Jews*, and other *Infidels*, saying, Is not this the *Christ*, of whom *Moses and the Prophets* did write ? For he has told me all that I have done, by the Spirit of their Prophecy.

(e) 1 Cor. xii. 3.

(f) Illa Mulier Typum gerebat Ecclesie, quæ ventura erat ex Gentibus, Ecclesie non justificatæ sed justificandæ. In *Johan. Evang. cap. 4. v. 7.*

Having then thus rightly stated the Controversy between the *Author of the Discourse*, &c. and his Opponents of the Clergy, and given my Reasons why the Affirmative of the Question in Dispute is to be held and maintain'd by them, I might now enter upon an Exhortation to both Parties, to a vigorous and zealous Debate of it. But before I do this, I think myself obliged to, what may be expected from me, deliver my Opinion of those particular Prophecies of the Old Testament, that are cited by the *Evangelists*, and which make a considerable Part of the Dispute before us. I should not have said, *deliver my Opinion*, but the *Opinion* of the Fathers; for I, so unlike am I to the rest of Mankind, have no Opinions but what I have taken from them. And all the Honour and Happiness I can pretend to, is to defend and illustrate their Opinions against all the Opposition of *Jews, Infidels, and Apostates*, to the contrary.

First then, the most remarkable Prophecy, that makes the greatest Noise in this Controversy, is that of *Isaiab*, Chap. vii. 14. *Behold, a Virgin shall be with Child, and shall bring forth a Son, and they shall call his Name Immanuel*; which is cited by *St. Matthew*, Chap. i. 22, 23. as fulfilled

fill'd at the miraculous Conception of Mary, and Birth of her Son *Jesus*. The *Author of the Discourse*, &c. very subtilly argues from Reason and Authority, that (g) *the Words, as they stand in Isaiah, do, in their obvious and literal Sense, relate to a young Woman in the Days of Ahaz, King of Judah, as appears by considering the Context*; and that it is an Absurdity to understand the Prophet, as having the Conception of the Virgin Mary, and the Birth of her Son *Jesus*, literally and primarily in view. On the other Hand, the Writers against the *Author of the Discourse*, &c. being concern'd for the Authority of St. *Matthew*, and for the Truth of the Application of this abrupt and clipt out Prophecy of *Isaiah*, will needs have it without the Context, to have a direct Aspect to the Conception of the Virgin Mary, and Birth of her Son *Jesus*; to which End they, particularly the *Bishop of L——*, write such Stuff, that in pity to their Ignorance, I will transcribe nothing of.

Now, by Virtue of that moderatorial Power that I have assumed to my self, or of that Commission I have receiv'd from the Fathers, I authoratively declare both

(g) Chap. viii. p. 40, &c.

Parties to be in an Error : And if they had consulted either the antient *Jews*, or the *Fathers* upon the Place, with that Veneration which is due to Antiquity, they would have set them right ; neither would the *Author of the Discourse*, &c. ever have made his Objection against this Prophecy of *Isaiah*, if modern Protestant Commentators, by their Apostacy from the Authority of the *Fathers*, had not given him a Handle to lay hold of.

Don't you know, *Sirs*, I speak to both Parties, how the antient *Jews* say, that all and every thing that *Isaiah*, and the other Prophets have written, is, in a metaphorical Sense, prophetic of the Divine *Logos* or *Messiah*? And don't you know that all the *Fathers*, as well as *St. Jerome*, were of the same Opinion? And don't you know, what you easily might know, that there are two (*b*) Births, as well as two Advents of Christ, the one after the *Flesh*, the other after the *Spirit*; and that, whatever is written by the *Evangelists*, of Christ's first Birth of the Virgin *Mary*, is, in the Opinion (*i*) of the *Fathers*, typical of

(*b*) Secundum Auctoritatem omnium Scripturarum duæ sunt Christi Nativitates. *August. Serm. Sup. 234.*

(*i*) Adventus Christi unus quidem in humilitate completus est, alius vero speratur in Gloria : & hic primus Adventus in Carne, mystico quodam Sermone in Scripturis Sanctis *Umbra* ejus appellatur. *Origen. in Lib. Jos. cap. 8.*

his second and spiritual Birth of a *Virgin Church*; neither did the Evangelist, St. *Matthew* himself, apply the said Prophecy of *Isaiab*, to the Conception of the *Virgin Mary*, and her Son *Jesus's* Birth, any otherwise than as that whole Story is typical of the more glorious and spiritual Birth and Advent of the *Messiah*, and Divine *Logos*.

St. *Augustin* says, that the *Virgin Mary* was a (k) Type of a *Virgin Church*, of whom *Jesus* will be again born. And St. *Ferome*, plainly enough upon the (l) Place in *Isaiab*, signifies, that it refers to the Divine *Logos's* second Birth of the Virginal Soul of a Church, uncorrupt with the spiritual Fornication of Idolatry; which Divine *Logos* can of necessity be no other than *Immanuel*, or God with us. It is not at all difficult to conceive, metaphorically speak-

(k) Nonne in Figura Mariæ Typum videmus Sanctæ Ecclesiæ — Ecclesiæ quam Meretricem invenit & Virginem fecit, — Maria peperit & Virgo est; sic & Ecclesia parit Christum & Virgo est. *In Serm.* 213.

(l) Virginem interpretamur Animam, quæ nulla Peccati corrupta est Conscientia, & profert de se *Immanuel*, Nobiscum Deum, id est præsentem Dei generare Sermone. *In Locum.* Juxta Tropologiam in Anima Virginali & nulla Sorde maculata, de spiritu Sancto Dei Sermo conceptus, velociter de adversariis Potestatibus Spolia detrahit, & sibi facit universa servire. *In Isai. cap. 8.*

ing,

ing, how such a *chaste Virgin* of the Church, as St. Paul (m) and (n) St. John write of, should be Pregnant, and bring forth the Spirit, or *Logos* of the Law; which, because of its rational Nature, and masculine Sense, may be frequently call'd a *Man-child*, or the *Son of Man*. The *Virgin Church*, who brings forth this mystical *Man-child*, must of necessity, according to *Isaiah*, be a (o) *Prophetess*, endow'd with the Spirit of Prophecy, or she can't be pregnant with the *Logos* of the Law of *Moses*. The Sign of the Birth of this *Man-child* is to be sought (p) (*in the Heights above, or Depths below*) in the Sublimity or Profundity of the Mysteries of God's Law. His Food is the delicious Sweetness and Fatness, like *Honey and Butter*, of the spiritual Sense of the Scriptures. And by that time, or before he has well made a Distinction between *Evil* and *Good*, or *Truth* and *Error*, *worldly Wisdom* and *Heresy*, like (q) *Rezin* and *Pekah*, that now

(m) 2 Cor. xi. 2.

(n) Revel. xii. 2.

(o) Isa. viii. 3.

(p) Per Profundum & Excelsum *אֵלֶּיָּהּ נָא וּנְסֵא לֵגִים* quidam intelligit. *Id. Isa. c. 7.*

(q) Duas autem Caudas torrium fumigantium (*viz. Rezin & Pekah*) sapientiam secularem & hereticum Sermionem intelligit, quorum finis Exustio est. *Ibid.*

reign,

reign in our spiritual Syria and Israel, will fly before him, &c.

After this manner is the Prophecy of *Isaiab* to be allegoriz'd and spiritualiz'd throughout. I have given you here but a short *Sketch* for a Taste, which whether any one can relish besides my self, I know not; but whoever is at all conversant in the Writings of the Fathers, must own it the very Image and Resemblance of *Origen*, *St. Hilary*, *St. Augustin*, and *St. Jerome*. It is beside my Business to stay, and make here a long Exposition on *Isaiab*; but this short Hint at present, may suffice to awaken some to a Consideration of the good old way of Interpretation, which the antient *Jews* and the Fathers will assist them in, and make easy, especially if they observe their constant, universal, and most celebrated (r) *Rule* of the Interpretation of the

(r) Apud Moses & Prophetas Nominum Impositiones manifestissime Res ipsas indicant. *Pbilo. Jude. in Lib. de Cherub.* Nomina hæc quæ videntur esse Lotorum Vocabula, ex Significantiis suis, quas in Lingua propria designant, rerum magis mysticarum Consequentiam quam Vocabulorum Appellationem videntur ostendere. *Origen. in Numer. cap. 21.* Nec hoc novum est Creatori figurate uti Translatione Nominum ex Comparatione Criminum. *Tertullian adv. Marcion. L. 3. c. 14.* Multa per Nominum Proprietates ita expressa, ut non magis gerendis in præsens, quam in futurum significandis impensa sunt. *St. Hilari*

the Names of Persons and Places; which, by the by, will give us to understand how *Adam* himself, according to (s) *St. Clement* of *Alexandria*, and (t) *Tertullian*, prophesied, when he gave Names to all living Creatures.

I do believe the Virginity of the Mother of our Lord, and will by no Means be induced to write against it: But it is ridiculous, very ridiculous and absurd to imagine, that God should give forth a Prophecy of the Conception of a *Virgin*, which is subject to counterfeit, and in its Completion liable to unanswerable Exceptions against it. Who can prove the Mother of *Jesus* to have been a *Virgin*, any otherwise than upon her own Word, and the good Opinion her Relations had of her? *Joseph*, to whom she was espoused, was suspicious of her Chastity; and, for ought we can demonstrate to the contrary against the *Jews*, *Jesus* might be *Panthera's*, a

Hilarii Ps. 67. Selt. 25. Nomina Interpretatione mystica & sapientia plena sunt. St. August. in Ps. 134. Selt. 19. Pro diversitate Vitiatorum & Interpretatione Nominum diversas possumus intelligere Nationes. St. Hieron. in Eze- kiel. cap. 3. &c.

(s) *Adam utile tunc (s) propter nomen negationis. Strom. Lib. I.*

(t) *Denique Adam ante Nomina Animalibus enuncia- vit, quam de Arbore decerpit; ante etiam prophetavit, quam voravit. De Carnis Resur.*

common

common Soldier's Son. Was the most modest young Lady of the City to be found pregnant, and ever so solemnly profess Ignorance of Man, her nearest Relation would not only disbelieve her, but the whole Town would make Sport with it. And were some Women now disposed to give their Wit a *Loose* to Infidelity, they would say such Things in Railery upon the Virgin *Mary*, and upon feminine Arts to sooth up a weak and jealous Husband into a good Humour, and upon that Master-piece of a pretended Ghost and Apparition, like an Angel, saying, *Fear not Joseph, &c.* as I care not to think of.

But the Chastity and Purity of that Virgin (n) Church, of which *Mary* was a Type, and her Uncorruptness with the spiritual Fornication of Idolatry will be intelligible and demonstrable, or it will be impossible for her to be pregnant with Divine Reason, and bring forth the *Man-child* of the *Logos* of the Law and the Prophets. The Fathers, as I said before, held and believ'd all that was transacted at Christ's first Birth, to be typical and figu-

(u) Ad hanc (Virginem Ecclesiam) sanctus descendit Spiritus, hanc Virtus Altissimi obumbravit; hanc potens Virtute Christus aggreditur. Hæc est immaculata Concubitu, fecunda Partu, Virgo Castitate, &c. St. *August.* in *Append. Serm.* 125. *Sect.* 5.

rative of what will be fulfill'd at his Second. Accordingly (w) *Tertullian* signifies to us what that *Star* will be, that is to be the Guidance and Direction of the wise Men of the *East*, or of Men of oriental Wisdom, such as are *Oneirocrites*, *Hieroglyphists*, *Mytists*, and symbolical *Philosophers*, to the Place of his Birth; and (x) *Origen* talks of Shepherds, or Pastors of Congregations keeping Watch over their Flocks in the Night of Ignorance and Error, to whom an Evangelical Minister, *Nuncio*, or Angel, will bring Tidings of Christ's second Birth, to their great Joy. But so much by way of Amusement, Instruction, and Illustration on the foresaid Prophecy of *Isaiab*, as cited by the Evangelist, and on which Commentators have been so impertinent, as to give Occasion to the *Author of the Discourse* to make Sport with it. I have no more to add here, but that all the glorious Things that are written (whether by the *Jewish* Prophets or *Gentile* Poets) of the expected *Messias*, of that Peace, Plenty, and Know-

(w) *Stellarum Interpretes* primi natum Christum annunciant. *De Idolatria*, cap. 9.

(x) Putasne nihil aliud divinius scripturarum Sermo significat, sed tantum hoc quod ad Pastores venerit Angelus? Audite Pastores Ecclesiarum, quod Angelus vobis annuntiabit, &c. *In Luc. C. 2. Hom. 12.*

ledge in his Time, when the Mountain of the Lord's House shall be exalted on the top of the Mountains; when Men shall beat their Swords into Plowshares, and the Lion shall lie down with the Lamb, &c. will receive their Completion upon the Advent of this mystical Son of Man, or Divine Offspring of the Virgin Church.

*Fam redit & Virgo, redeunt Saturnia Regna,
Fam nova Progenies Caelo demittitur alto
Chara Deum soboles, magnum Jovis Incremen-*

— Divum Genus, aurea condet (tum.

Secula qui rursus Latio, regnata per Arva

Saturno quondam, super & Garamantas &

(Indos

Proferet Imperium. —

Ille Deum Vitam accipiet, Divisque videbit

Permixtos Heroas, & ipse videbitur illis

Pacatumque reget patriis Virtutibus Orbem

— Nec magnos metuent Armenta Leones.

And it is ridiculous in the Bishop of Litchfield, and others, to apply such Predictions of either Poets or Prophets, to Jesus and his Church, for the Time past, when her Fate has been hitherto nothing but Persecutions, Wars, Strife, and Variance: And it is a wonder that the Author of the Grounds, &c. or some other Infidel, has not, before now, with his Satyr, fallen

len upon our Divines, for such nonsensical and impertinent Applications of Prophecies, which could have no possible relation to any Ages of the Church past.

2. The Second Prophecy of the Old Testament, and cited in the *New*, and taken Notice of by the *Author of the Discourse*, is in *Matth. ii. 15.* where the Evangelist, speaking of Jesus's going into *Egypt*, and Return out of it, says that was done, that it might be fulfill'd which was spoken of the Lord by the Prophet, saying, Out of *Egypt* have I called my Son. "Which Words," says the *Author of the Discourse*, &c. are found in *Hosea xi. 1.* "and according to their obvious Sense," "are no Prophecy, but relate to a past Action of the calling of the Children of *Israel* out of *Egypt*, and not to *Jesus's* coming out of *Egypt*." And he very pleasantly diverts himself with *Surenhusius*, *Whiston*, and others, about their Application of the said Prophecy to our *Jesus*, in a manner, that blushing for their Ignorance and Impertinence, I care not to take Notice of. But my Answer, in the Name of the Fathers, in short is, that the said Prophecy of *Hosea* no farther relates to *Jesus's* being call'd out of *Egypt*, than as *Jesus's* coming out of *Egypt*, was a
Type

Type of the calling him, with his Church afterwards, out of *spiritual Egypt*, after the manner that the *Israelites* were taken out of *litteral Egypt*. *St. Hilary* (y) upon the Place in *St. Matthew*, is exactly of this Opinion; and (z) *St. Jerome*, in his Commentaries on *Hosea*, makes the Words to be a Prophecy of the Redemption of New *Israel*, the Church in whom *Jesus* was, out of *Egypt*, after the Example of the Deliverance of old *Israel*. And any one who is acquainted with my *Writings*, knows I can prove how New *Israel* was deliver'd and call'd out of the *spiritual Egypt* of the *Gentile* Idolatry of the Empire of *Rome*, after the similitude of Old *Israel's* coming out of *Egypt* before. It is ridiculous to imagine, that the Prophecy of *Hosea* had a sole View to, and did terminate in *Jesus's* being call'd out of *Egypt*, which is contrary to the Opinion of the (a) Fathers, who all of them held,

(y) Typica Ratio servata est. In *Matt. cap. 2.*

(z) Dilexit nos Deus & vocavit de Tribulatione & Tenebris *Egypti*; vocavit autem per Apostolos & Doctores Ecclesiarum. In *Hos. cap. xi. v. 1.*

(a) Siquidem Symbola quædam erant quæ tunc gerebantur, eorum quæ semper *Jesu* Virtute perficiuntur. *Origen. in Matt. c. 15.* Veritati præsentium futurorum species adjecta est. — Hæc licet in præsens gesta sunt, quid tamen in futurum significant, contuendum est. *Hilar. in Matt. cap. 8. Sect. 8. & cap. 10. Sect. 1.*

that

that whatever was done by *Jesus* in the *Flesh*, was but a Type of what would be done by him in the *Spirit*: And besides, such a Completion literally of Prophecy, is liable to counterfeit; and a *false Christ*, as well as the true one, may go into *Egypt*, and return out of it, saying, *All this was done by him, that it might be fulfill'd which was spoken by the Prophet Hosea, saying, Out of Egypt have I call'd my Son.*

3. Another supposed Prophecy of the Old Testament, taken Notice of by the *Author of the Discourse, &c.* and refer'd to by *St. Matth. ii. 23.* stands thus: *Jesus came and dwelt at Nazareth, that it might be fulfill'd which was spoken by the Prophets, saying, He shall be call'd a Nazarene.* Which Citation, says the *Author of the Discourse, &c.* occurs not expressly in any Place of the Old Testament, and therefore the Old Testament can't be said literally to be fulfill'd therein: And he diverts himself with *Surenbusius's* Labours, to find out this Prophecy. But I, as a *Moderator*, interpose, and in the Name of the Fathers, say, that the Words *Nazareth* and *Nazarene*, are to be interpreted by the primitive Rule, according to their spiritual Signification; and then any one may discern with

with (b) *Origen* and (c) *St. Jerome*, how *Jesus* is or will be the *Nazarene* of the *City Nazareth*, that is, the *Holy One* of the *Holy City* of the *Church*, which for its *Sanctity* may some time or other deserve to be call'd *Nazareth*, as well as *Jerusalem*, for its *Peace* and *Vision*. And he must be very ignorant of the *Prophets*, who is not aware that they all have prophesied of our *Jesus*, for his being the *Nazarene*, or *Holy One* of our *Israel*. Had there been literally extant such a *Prophecy* of the *Messias* in the *Old Testament*, as *that he should be call'd a Nazarene*, of the *City of Nazareth*, then both *that*, and its *Completion*, would have been ridiculous; in as much as every *Impostor*, or *false Christ*, that would be pleas'd to go to *Nazareth*, might assume that *Title*.

4. The *Author of the Discourse*, &c. observes, " That *Jesus* says of *John* the *Baptist*, *this is the Elias* (d) *that was for to come*: Wherein he is supposed to refer

(b) *Evangelista Patriam (Nazareth) nominat ob aliquid quod mystice per Locum Patriæ significetur. In Matth. cap. 13.*

(c) *Nazaræus id est Sanctus Domini. In Ezechiel, cap. 7.*

(d) *Matth. xi. 14.*

“ to those Words of *Malachi*, (e) *Behold*
 “ *I will send you Elias the Prophet, before*
 “ *the coming of the great and terrible Day*
 “ *of the Lord*; which, according to their
 “ literal Sense, are a Prophecy that *Elias*
 “ was to come in Person, and therefore
 “ were not literally, but mystically ful-
 “ fill’d by *John the Baptist*.” To whose
 Observation I subscribe, and only add to
 it, that in the Opinion of the Fathers, *Je-*
sus called *John the Baptist Elias*, only be-
 cause he was the (f) Type of *Elias*, who,
 as *Jesus* himself says, before his spiritual
 Advent, *will come and restore all Things*.
 Neither is there any necessity, in the Opi-
 nion of even (g) *Jews*, as well as Fathers,
 that the same identical and individual Per-
 son of old *Elias* should come for this Pur-
 pose. If somebody else prove but a *Tisbite*,
 that is, a *Converter* of the *Jews*, a *Turner*
 of the Hearts of the Children to the Fa-
 thers, a Restorer of all Things, and a Ful-
 filler of all Things, in a mystical Sense,
 that are written of old *Elias*, I conceive

(e) *Malachi* iv. 5.

(f) *Johannes* dicitur *Elias* quia in eo *Christus* prae-
 figurare voluit futurum Adventum suum, & hoc dicere,
 quia in Spiritu *Eliæ* erat *Johannes*, & quod erat *Johannes*
 ad primum hoc erit *Elias* ad secundum Adventum. *Au-*
gust. in Johan. Evang. c. 2.

(g) *Discourse of the Grounds*, p. 76.

he may be rightly dignified with the Name and Title of the Evangelical *Elias*. Mr. *Whiston*, in his *literal Accomplishments of Scripture Prophecy*, (b) doubts whether these Words of our Saviour, *Elias shall come first and restore all Things*, be Prophetical or not; and, very unlike to a *Reviver of Primitive Christianity*, refers his Doubts, and his Readers, forsooth, to Mr. *Mede*. If Mr. *Whiston* has espous'd the Opinion, that the Words were prophetical of another *Elias* to come, than was *John the Baptist*, and had referr'd his Readers to all the Fathers, for full and ample Satisfaction in the Case, he then in some measure would have deserv'd to be honour'd and dignified with the Title of a *Reviver of Primitive Christianity*.

5. The *Author of the Discourse*, &c. says, "Jesus cites this Prophecy of *Isaiab*,
 " *By bearing ye shall hear, and shall not*
 " *understand*; as if he assured us, it was
 " fulfill'd in his Time, in those to whom
 " he spoke in Parables; though it is ma-
 " nifest, that according to the literal
 " Sense, it relates to the obstinate *Jews*,
 " who lived in the Time of *Isaiab*. The

Author of the Discourse, &c. shoots this directly at the Reputation of the Holy *Jesus*, for assuming to himself a Prophecy, and its Completion upon the *Jews*, under his Parabolical Ministry; when it related only to the *Jews*, in the Days of *Isaiab*. But notwithstanding this his Opinion, it is impossible for him to conjecture, wherein the wilful Deafness of those *Jews* consisted, or what the Doctrine of *Isaiab* was, which they so shut their Ears and their Eyes against. The *Author of the Discourse* may be pleas'd to take Notice, that it was the Opinion of all the antient *Jews* and Fathers, as is above observ'd, that *Isaiab*, and the other Prophets wrote all in Parables, which, in a metaphorical Sense, would receive their Completion in the Days of the *Messiah*; and if this Prophecy before us was not compleatly fulfill'd upon the *Jews*, in the time of that typical State of *Christ's* first Advent in the Flesh; it will be, in the Opinion of the Fathers, most substantially fulfill'd, under his spiritual Advent, when Ecclesiastical *Ministers of the Letter* will be wilfully Deaf and Blind to the *Mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven*, which will be taught them in open'd Parables.

And

And thus have I spoke to all those Prophecies of the Old Testament, cited in the Evangelists, with which the *Author of the Discourse*, &c. with his pleasant Observations on modern *Commentators*, thinks he has smitten the *Messiahship* of our *Jesus*, and wounded the Truth of Christianity. Whether I have said any Thing to the Purpose, or more to the Satisfaction of the *Author of the Discourse*, &c. than other *Commentators*, let him judge. Whether these my Expositions and Account for the Difficulties of the said Prophecies, which have puzzled the Learned of these Ages, will please the Clergy, I am unconcern'd. I write entirely upon the Authority of the Fathers, whose Opinions I espouse, and am able to defend and illustrate. And from the foresaid Prophecies thus accounted for, I again conclude seriously, not jocosely, with the (i) *Author of the Discourse*, that Christianity is the allegorical Sense of the Old Testament, and that Gentiles as well as Jews, must be convinc'd by Allegory, and become Allegorists; for the Religion it self, to which they are to be converted, is Christianity, as allegorically taught in the Old Testament.

Now I come to exhort the *Author of the Discourse*, &c. and his Opponents, with Warmth, Zeal, and Vigor, to prosecute the Controversy between them; which of necessity must end in the Overthrow of the Truth of Christianity, or in its sure, only sure Foundation of the Prophecy of the Old Testament. And accordingly I do thus address my self in the manner following, to both Parties separately. And,

First to the Clergy. I wonder, *Sirs*, that upon the Rise of this Controversy, none of you apply'd to me for Assistance, who, if any Man, could have defended Christianity upon your Adversary's Principles, and have beaten him with his own Weapons. It was but by Chance that I read *The Discourse of the Grounds*, many Months after its Publication; and how well I was pleas'd with it, I need not say, more than that it is the greatest Curiosity in Print, I ever met with. If I had happen'd to read it, upon its first coming forth, I should have given an *Answer* to it another way. But now that the *Clergy*, without asking my Advice, have run of their own Heads against this potent *Adversary*, I will act the Part of an equal Judge and *Moderator* between you: And if I applaud

applaud not any of your Writings against the said *Author*, nor any of the *Apologetical* Discourses which this Age has produced ; yet I will take care that the Truth of *Jesus's Messiahship*, shall not suffer by the Objections of your *Adversary*. This I will do for the Love of Truth, and the Honour of the *Holy Jesus*, more than for any Respect I bear to such Contenders for Christianity, as are the *Clergy* at this Day.

Let me tell you, *Sirs*, again and again, that the Truth of Christianity is only to be defended upon the *Affirmative* of the Question above, which if it be impossible to maintain, we must of Consequence give up our Religion to *Jews* and *Infidels*. But as I doubt not the Possibility of the Defence of the *Affirmative* of the Question, so I would persuade and exhort you to search the *Scriptures*, for the alone sure and indisputable prophetical Testimony of *Jesus's Messiah*.

Good *Sirs*, be persuaded to take the Matter into Consideration again, and let's know what you can mean by *Jesus's* being the *Messiah*. Is it any thing else than that he is the *Logos*, the *Spirit*, the *Life*, and the *Fulfiller* of the Law and the Prophets? And how can he fulfil them, or be the Spirit of them, if they don't prophesy
of

of him? And how do they prophesy of him? Not literally (for that's an Absurdity to suppose) but typically, allegorically, and metaphorically, in the Opinion of both *Jews* and *Fathers*. In the Opinion, I say, of the *Jews*, as well as *Fathers*; for though there are and have been of Old, an Anti-allegorical Sect among the *Jews*, call'd *Caraites*, yet, as the *Author of the Discourse*, &c. rightly asserts, the *Jewish* (k) Expectation of a *Messiah*, was founded on the allegorical Method, without which they have no Reason, nor Authority, to establish their Belief of a *Messiah* to come: Neither can *Christians*, of Consequence, prove our *Jesus* to be the *Messiah*, without a Recourse to the said Method. Therefore must we, *Sirs*, betake our selves again to the allegorical and metaphorical way of Interpretation of the *Old Testament*, and look upon the *Types* in it, and search for *Antitypes* in the *New*, and adapt one to the other, like a *Pair of Covenants and Indentures*, as the only Course we can take, to prove our *Jesus* under the *New Testament*, to be the *Messiah* and Fulfiller of the *Old*. All other Methods and Arguments to prove *Christ's Authority and Messiahship*,

are but Ramble and Impertinence. But *this*, the Veil of the Letter of the Law, and the Prophets being done away, will give us a Sight of the Glory of God, *face to face*, through the Revelation of the Gospel, to the Demonstration of the *Messiahship* of our *Jesus*. And such a Vision of God and his Providence in the Harmony of the *Gospel* with the *Law*, Spiritually interpreted, or in the Consonancy of the *Christian* to the *Israelitish* Church in a Figure, must of necessity stop the Mouths of all Gain-sayers. And I am of Opinion, that such a Work will be done to Perfection, not in a whimsical and imaginary Fashion, as some are used to speak of allegorical Interpretations, but in a solid and substantial one, in which the clearest *Toothings* and *Indentings* between the two Testaments will be so visible, upon the Testimony of History and Authority, that of consequence it must end in the Conviction and Conversion of both *Jews* and *Infidels*.

It is lamented by Dr. Stanhope, and Dr. Jenkins (as I find it in *the Discourse of the Grounds*) that (1) the *allegorical*, or, as I should call it, the *prophetical* Way of

(1) Page 52.

interpreting the Scriptures, which was in Use with the antient *Jews*, Apostles, and Fathers of the Church, is *now lost*. And it must be confess'd, that the *Key of Knowledge*, which, according to (m) *Origen*, lay in mystical and allegorical Interpretations, has, by literal Commentators of these last Ages, been so *taken away*, and unhappily laid aside, that they know not where to find it : But I, by Conversation with the Antients, have retrieved *that Key*, and will communicate the Use of it to you, *Sirs* ; not doubting but it will open a *Door* of Prophecy, into the Church of Christ that's built upon the Law and the Prophets, for the Entrance of *Jews* and *Infidels*, to behold the Glory of God in it.

Mr. *Whiston* is indeed so averse to allegorical Interpretations of the Scriptures, as I understand from *the* (n) *Author of the Discourse*, &c. that it is his Opinion, they are *the most pernicious and ill-grounded Things that ever were admitted among Christians*, and tend to *expose our Religion*

(m) Qui criminantur Expositionem allegoricam & docere volunt manifestam esse scripturam, & nihil habere amplius, quam Textus ostendit, neque diviniorem aliquem sensum, tulerunt Clavem Scientiæ, & omnem Legis Viam ad Intelligenda legitima auferunt. *In Matt. Tract. 25.*

(n) Page 98.

to the Laughter of Infidels. I don't suppose he is of this Opinion by himself, because he has many Admirers that take any thing upon Trust from him. But I can tell him, that the Fathers, and the antient *Jews*, were of a contrary Mind : For not only (n) *Origen* tells us, that literal Commentaries on the Scriptures, would run the Church into Infidelity ; but the *Jews* (o) say, that even *Atheists* themselves would be converted by *Cabalistical* Divinity, or allegorical Interpretations, because that therein lay the way to the (p) *Knowledge of the Perfections of God and his Providence.* To whose Opinion I subscribe, believing that God in his Providence will be no otherwise seen, than by open Visions on the Law and the Prophets, spiritually and mystically interpreted. But for a farther Answer to Mr. *Whiston*, it is certain that the Fathers, who were all *Allegorists*, converted the *Gentiles* of all Denominations, to Christianity ; and it is no less certain, that the primitive Christians, allegorizing and tropologizing the Law, saw God *Face to Face*, through the Glass of *Ænigmas*.

(n) *Litteram Legis sequentes in Infidelitatem & vanas superstitiones incurrunt. In Matt. Tract. 26.*

(o) *Basnage's History of the Jews*, p. 192.

(p) *Ibid.* p. 184.

And though Mr. *W.* be so far apostatiz'd from *primitive Christianity*, as to think literal Expositions would rather convert *Infidels*; yet Infidelity, according to *Origen's* Prediction above, never more abounded than in this our Age, in which literal Commentaries are almost altogether publish'd. And I don't doubt but the *Author of the Discourse*, &c. will take care, that neither Mr. *Whiston's* *literal Accomplishments of Scripture Prophecies*, nor his new devis'd *Canon of Scripture*, for the Reconciliation of the *Old* and *New Testament*, shall make any Converts among his unbelieving Friends and Infidels.

Mr. *Whiston* also is of Opinion, as I learn from the *Author of the Discourse*, &c. that the (*q*) *allegorical Scheme*, as he calls it, of the Interpretation of Scripture, obstructs the Conversion of the *Jews*, and hardens them in Infidelity. If Mr. *W.* do not stand by himself in this Opinion; yet not only the generality of Writers, as Mr. *Basnage* (*r*) says, are of a contrary one, complaining, that the cabalistical and mystical Divinity is too much neglected, or the *Jews* would be better and sooner converted; but especially the primitive Fa-

(*q*) Page 183.

(*r*) History of the *Jews*, p. 184.

thers, who by their allegorical Interpretations, brought Thousands upon Thousands of them to the Faith in Christ: Neither can any other Reason be assign'd, why the *Jews* persist in Unbelief, so obstinately at this Day, than the Church's Apostacy from the Spirit of the Law and the Prophets. Since the allegorical Interpretations have been so much out of Use, we rarely hear of the Conversion of a *Jew*, whose Sincerity is not suspected; and were any of the Apostles and Fathers of the Church now alive, they would say *now* what they did of Old, that the Infidelity of the *Jews* proceeded from the *Veil* of the Letter of the Law, that *was upon their and our Hearts, in the reading of the Old Testament*. And though the *Jewish* Writers, of late Ages, against Christianity, do, as the (s) *Author of the Discourse* observes, object against us our allegorical Interpretations of the Old Testament; yet what is the Reason of that? Because that being prejudiced and possess'd with an Aversion to Christianity, and knowing that our *Allegorists* of old converted Multitudes of them to the Faith, therefore they expose and ridicule allegorical Expo-

(s) 81, 82, 83.

fitions, though they implicitly thereby depart from that Doctrine of their Ancestors, on which, and which alone, is founded the Expectation of a *Messiah*. Because then the *Jews* at this Day are Enemies to Allegories, therefore Mr. *Whiston* thinks we should give up the allegorical Scheme of Interpretation, as the (t) *grand Stumbling-block in the way of the Conversion of the Jews to Christianity*: Is not this poor Reasoning in Mr. *W.*? Just like his Reason for the Exclusion of the Book of *Canticles* out of the Bible, because some of his impious (u) Acquaintance scoff'd at it, as a loose and obscene Piece, in a way he could not answer. But however, when I hear that Mr. *Whiston's* literal Expositions, and *Accomplishments of Scripture Prophecy*, make many *Jewish* Converts, I will be of his Mind. In the mean Time, I do and must believe, that the Illustration and Application of the Types under the Law to our *Jesus*, and the proving him a Prophet like *Moses*, by a mystical Interpretation of *Exodus*, to be a most cogent and irresistible Argument of his *Messiahship* to the *Jews*, which must captivate them upon the Prin-

(t) *Discourse on the Grounds*, p. 83.

(u) *Supplement to his Essay*.

ciples of their Ancestors ; who, I say it again, founded their Expectation of a Messiah, on the allegorical Interpretation of the Law, and admitted of the Maxim of St. Paul, that *all Things happen'd to their Fathers in Types and Figures.*

St. *Augustin*, who is of as good Authority as Mr. *W.* says, that the (*w*) Law is spiritually to be expounded for the Conversion of the *Jews*, who thereupon will discern our *Jesus* to be the *Christ*, or Messiah of it. And moreover, it was his Opinion that *Elias*, who was to be the Converter of the *Jews*, in the latter Times of the Apostacy, would do it by a (*x*) spiritual or allegorical Interpretation of the Scriptures. And indeed both *Jews* and Fathers are of Opinion, that *Elias* can't do his Work of Restoration, without an allegorical Interpretation of the Law and the Prophets : And how should he ? For the Restoration of all Things consisting in an accurate adapting of the History of the Christian Church, to the *Jewish Oeconomy* ; how

(*w*) Discant Judæi spiritaliter Legem intelligere, atque in ea invenient Christam. *De Civit. Dei.* Lib. XX. c. 28.

(*x*) Cum ergo venerit exponendo Legem spiritaliter, quam Judæi carualiter sapiunt, convertet Cor Patrum ad filios, &c. *Ibid.* c. 29.

should

should *Elias* do this, unless he allegorically interpret the Law? How can he, like a wise Steward, bring forth out of the Treasure of the Scripture, Things both *New* and *Old*; that is, the new Things of the Gospel harmoniously agreeing to the old Things of the Law, unless he mystically interpret the Law to that End.

Was *Elias* to come in these our Days, to *restore all Things*, allegorically to interpret the Scriptures, and to hold an Argument with Mr. *W.* on this Head; it would give me much pleasure, to hear how Mr. *W.* would oppose St. *Paul*, the Fathers, and *Elias* himself, upon the spiritual and *allegorical Scheme* of Interpretation of Oracles. If *Elias* should happen to be flow of Speech, and Mr. *W.* talkative, I don't doubt but the *Clergy*, the *Auditors* of such a Conference, concluding, that in the greatest multiplicity of Words there was most Reason (or they would not admire some voluminous Writers) would decree him *Conqueror*.

The *Author of the Discourse*, &c. very learnedly and pleasantly diverts himself, and his Readers, with Mr. *W.*'s *Absurdities*, *Contradictions*, and *Paradoxes*; and I own, I took much Satisfaction upon this Account, in the reading of him. I have as great an Esteem for Mr. *Whiston*, as any
Man

Man need to have; and though I am no *Mathematician* my self, yet upon common Fame, I believe him an excellent one; but for his Divinity I never had any Respect. His *Supplement to his Essay*, where he is for excluding the *Canticles* as an obscene Book, out of the *Canon of Scripture*, has increas'd my Disgust to his Theology to the last Degree; because that Book is a most celebrated one with Antiquity, both with *Jews* and *Fathers*, for its mystical Representation of the Love between Christ and his Church: Neither had any one Book of the whole *Bible*, more Interpreters among the *Fathers*, who seem to be in a Rapture, as they treat on it; and among whom there was an holy Emulation, who should rise highest to the Sublimity of its Mysteries. Any one that has read *Origen's* Remains on the *Canticles*, can't possibly, one would think, entertain Mr. *Whiston's* Opinion. And I could never have believ'd, that a seriously pretended *Reviver of primitive Christianity*, would have rejected that *Sacred Book*, without any antient Authority (excepting such as *Theodoret* (y) speaks of, who were like Mr. *Whiston's* profane Friends, that gave him the Hint

(y) In *Proem. ad Cant. Solom.*

to rail against it) or without any other Reason than because to himself, being unable to reach to the mystical Sense of it, it seem'd to be a *loose and obscene Piece*. This, I say, increas'd my Disgust at Mr. *Whiston's* Writings; but when I beheld his Opinion above, against the allegorical Interpretations of the Scriptures, because they tend to harden *Jews* and *Infidels* in Unbelief; and his Notion about the Corruption of our *Bible*, and his way to help us to another, my Stomach was turn'd against them.

Mr. *Whiston* would be thought a zealous Contender for the Doctrines of the primitive Church, and has publish'd Four *Volumes* in *Octavo*, call'd *Primitive Christianity Reviv'd*. The other Day, and not before, I took those *Volumes* into my Hands: And what would any rational Man, before his Perusal of them, conclude they consisted of? Nothing less, certainly, than of many old Principles of the Fathers reviv'd and illustrated; or of the old Arguments for the Truth of Christianity, against *Jews* and *Gentiles*, which he had given new Life and Force to. But instead of *this*, they consist of a Story of his Banishment from *Cambridge*; of his Controversy with the Convocation; of an Epistolary Correspondence with some Friends; of a new Edition

Edition of *Ignatius's* Epistles, and the Apostolical Constitutions, with his Dissertations on them; and of an Edition of the Second Book of *Esdra's*; all which (excepting his Account of the Primitive Faith, in which he is mistaken) have no more Relation to the *Title* of his Books, than most of the Sermons that are now a Days preach'd, are a-kin to the Texts they are pretended to treat on.

Had I been born with, and educated with an Aversion to the *Clergy* of this Age, whom I have loved to a Fault, and should be overjoy'd to see them exposed to the last Degree, for Ignorance and Impertinence; I could not wish any one to do it more effectually than Mr. *W.* will, if he goes on. As he has a great many Admirers among the *Clergy*, who implicitly follow him as *Sheep* do a *Bell wether*, so his *Schemes* about the Corruptness of the *Hebrew Bible*, and his Design (as the *Author of the Discourse*, &c. represents it, for I never read his *Essay*) to publish a new one (which his Friends will take upon Trust, and others, being ignorant of the Reason of the present Difference between the *Hebrew* and *Greek Text*, will be unable to confute) must of necessity expose the whole *Clerical Body* to the Contempt of the Age ensuing. But nothing will more

substantially do this, than *his* Opinion that the allegorical Interpretations of the Scriptures, exposes our Religion to the *Insults* of *Jews* and *Infidels*; which Opinion, however gross and absurd in it self, the Clergy will not dare to gainsay, because of the fatal Consequence of it to their Reputation and Interests.

I have a Story to tell Mr. *Whiston*, and I know not where more pertinently to bring it in, than in this Place; and that is, that it was the universal Opinion, as appears from (z) *Athanasius*, (a) *Hilary*, and (b) *Prosper Aquitanicus*, of the *Homoousian* Fathers, of the Fourth and Fifth Centuries, that *Arianism* made way for, and prepared the Church for the coming of *Antichrist*. I, being a Man of Curiosity, could not forbear searching into History for the Truth of this Opinion: Accordingly, upon strict Enquiry, I do find that the great *Antichrist* was born in the Fifth Century, and was begotten by *Armillus* on a *Babylonish* Whore, who was the Daughter of

(z) Ἀρεῖαν ἀρεῖαν χριστομάχον οὖσαν καὶ τοῦ Ἀντιχριστοῦ προδεσφύον. In Apol. cont. Arian. Sect. 90.

(a) Nam ipsi (Ariani) nunc Christum novum, per quem Anti-Christus subreperet, intulerunt. In Lib. cont. Auxentium.

(b) Arianos signat Prophetā, Præcursores Anti-Christi. In Dimid. Temp. cap. 10.

Arius: Whether he was his legitimate or spurious *Off-spring*, I stay'd not to enquire; but for the Truth of this Story, I am able to account, when call'd upon to it. And it is plain that *Antichrist*, the genuine Descendant of *Arius*, is now grown up to a huge Monster of Nonsense, Incoherence, Impertinence; or his Grandchildren of this Generation would not advance such a bulky Absurdity and Contradiction to all Sense, Reason, and Authority, as is this, that *the allegorical Interpretation of the Law and the Prophets, obstructs the Conversion of both Jews and Infidels.*

But so much at present for Mr, *Whiston*; I return then to my Exhortation of you, *Sirs*, again to *search the Scriptures*, by an allegorical Interpretation of them, for a Testimony of the *Messiahship* of our *Jesus*. And I would not so often and most seriously urge and press you to this, if I myself was not of Ability to demonstrate the Truth of Christianity accordingly, and fully persuaded and convinc'd in my Conscience, that there is no other way to prove our *Jesus* to be the *Christ* and *Messiah*. It is not, *Sirs*, to strengthen and confirm your *Adversary* in his Objection against our Religion, that I am for holding the *Affirmative* of the Question in Dispute, but
to

to excite you to a Defence of Christianity, according to it; whereby you will humour the *Author of the Discourse*, &c. in his Objection, and convince him upon his own Principles. If I am partial, I say it again, it is on your Side, being more zealous for the Truth of our Religion, and better able to defend it, than any of you all. And if you please to allow of your *Adversary's* prime Position, that *Christianity is founded on the Old Testament*, or that the Gospel of *Christ* is only to be proved from the Predictions of the Law and the Prophets, and will proceed in your Vindications of our Religion according to it, you shall find me your real Friend and Abettor, who will assist and direct you to this Purpose. For I will not stand by, as an unconcern'd and disinterested *Moderator*, and see Christianity suffer by the Impotency of your Defences, or by the Power of the Objection of your *Adversary*; whose most ingenious and learn'd Performance, I hope, will have no worse Effect upon the *Church*, than to awaken her *Priests* to a Vindication of her Religion from Prophecy, as the alone most *sure* and *solid* Foundation, she is built on.

It is the Opinion of Mr. *Newcome*, one of the Writers against the *Author of the Discourse*,

Discourse, &c. that (c) the Study of the Prophecies has perhaps been too much neglected, so that this zealous Opposition may providentially be of great Service to the Christian Church, and promote a more accurate Understanding of the Prophetick Writings; of whose Opinion I am exactly, and hope that this Book of the Adversary, which Mr. Newcome unwarily calls Pernicious, may in the End be of good Consequence, so as to dispose, if not force some to prove the Truth of our Religion from Prophecy; which, if clearly made out, the Author of the Discourse will allow to be a most sure, proper, and indisputable Evidence and Proof of it. And who is the Man that would not think himself happy, and exalted to Honour, that should do this; that is, prove the Messiahship of Jesus, from the exact Harmony of the Gospel to the Law of Moses, so as for ever to put to Silence, and stop the Mouths of Jews and Infidels against him. To this Purpose the said Mr. Newcome says again, (d) that it must be very acceptable to God, and honourable to our selves, to understand the prophetick Language; or rather, as he should have

(c) See his Sermon of the more sure Word of Prophecy, p. 39.

(d) Ibid. p. 39.

said, the *prophetick Stile*; for the prophetick Languages are the *Hebrew* and the *Greek*, which many understand well; but the *prophetick Stile*, as *St. Clement of Alexandria* says, is *parabolical*, which no body understands besides *Mr. Newcome*, or myself. But excusing this Mistake, which is the same that (e) *Mr. Whiston* has often committed, and is but a small *Blunder*, in comparison of the huge *Bulls*, greater *Doctors of Divinity* have made, I think his Sermon, for these two foresaid Expressions, worthy of the Light: Neither do I see any other Reason why *Dr. Snape*, the then *Vice-Chancellor*, and the *Heads* of the *University of Cambridge*, desired him to print it, excepting this one, that being charm'd with the Sound of the Words, *Types*, *Figures*, *Symbols*, *Allegories*, and *Hieroglyphicks*, which often occur in it, they laid hold of this Opportunity by a Publication of that Sermon, to testify to the World their Approbation of, and Esteem for the *Symbolical Philosophy* and *Theology* of the greatest *Typist*, *Mystist*, *Hieroglyphist*, and *Oneirocrite* in the Universe, who returns them his hearty Thanks for that Compliment upon himself, and Reproof of

(e) See the *Discourse of the Grounds*, p. 248, &c.

his *Defamers*. No other Consideration, I dare say, moved Dr. *Snape* to encourage an otherwise empty Invective against the supposed *Author of the Discourse*, &c. who for his great Learning, and other excellent Endowments, is a greater Honour to *King's College*, than any *Doctor of Divinity* that ever was Member of it. If I am mistaken in these Conjectures, I expect to be rightly inform'd, and then I will retract publickly, and make such Observations on that Sermon, as shew, Men of learned and wakeing Ears, could not approve of it.

But to return again to the Business in Hand, which is to exhort you, *Sirs*, to a Proof of Christianity from Prophecy, or of the *Messiahship* of *Jesus*, from his Completion of the Types and Predictions of him in the Law and the Prophets. I can't too often say it, that the *Logos*, or *Spirit* of the Law of *Moses*, and the Prophets, is the *Rock*, on which alone the Church can be built; and the trusting to, or devising of any other Arguments for the Truth of our Religion, is but building on a *Sandy Foundation*. It is the common Complaint of the Clergy, that Infidelity gains Ground, and I verily believe it: But what is the Cause of it? If the Clergy would lay their Hands upon their Hearts,

N

they

they might be conscious, that their own irrational, incoherent, and impertinent Defences of Religion, have occasion'd many sensible *Gentlemen* to call the Truth of it into Question. With the Multitude of *Boylean Lectures*, Infidelity increaseth. And I am so far from wondering that there should be *Infidels* among us, that I much more wonder, that, considering the Absurdities and Contradictions, the *Advocates* for Religion advance, there is, among Gentlemen of Sense and Reading, so much as one Believer of the Truth of it. We may see how the *Author of the Discourse*, &c. sports himself with such Inconsistencies and Absurdities of the *Writers* of the Church, as do infer that Religion is not defensible upon any of their Principles, much less upon all of them taken together. And were not the *Writers* for Christianity, concern'd more in *Interest* than in *Principle*, for the Truth of it, I should think *them* principally, considering the Inferences that naturally flow from their Tenets, no better than Unbelievers in Disguise, who under the Pretence of writing for the Christian Religion, like the *Author of the Discourse*, &c. had nothing more in View than the Overthrow of it. Was I to go about to collect the many gross Incoherencies and Absurdities that are published

lish'd in Behalf of Christianity, I should never have done. But to mention some of them, with Relation to our present Case; what's a greater Contradiction than what Dr. *Nicholls* (f) asserts, that it is *the Glory of Christianity to be founded on Allegory*; and what a Writer against the *Author of the Discourse*, &c. affirms, in the very Title of his Pamphlet, that *the Christian Religion is not founded on Allegory*? What's more incoherent than the Opinion of Dr. *Jenkins*, Mr. *Dallee*, and others, that *the Old Testament is the most plain of all antient Writings, and easy to be understood*; and the Opinion of Mr. *Dodwell*, Dr. *Hare*, and others, that it is hard to be understood; being involv'd with the Obscurities of *Types, Tropes, and Figures*? What's a greater Absurdity than Mr. *Whiston's* literal mystical Scheme, or than his Enmity to Allegories, together with his Reception of *Barnabas's* Epistle into the Canon; or that his Assertion of St. *Jerome's* being the first allegorical Interpreter, when he is conscious that all the Fathers of the preceding Ages were such too? But the Bulwark of *Anti-Christianism*, the Source of Confusion within the Church,

(f) *Discourse of the Grounds*. p. 269.

and the *Asylum* of Infidels without, is *that* horrible Opinion, of most pernicious Consequence, which *Christian Writers*, particularly *Protestants*, have first advanc'd and defended, *viz.* that the *Jewish Cabala*, or mystical Theology, is of no older a Date than after the *Captivity*. This Opinion, Father *Simon*, *Mons. Le Clerc*, and *Dr. Spencer*, whom I account no better than Infidels, espouse, and smite Christianity to the *Quick* with it. And we see the *Author of the Discourse* (g) embraces it, and by the Means of it, plays fast and loose with our Religion, pulling down at one time, what he would seem to build up at another with Allegories. If we let this Opinion pass uncorrected, we must allow the *Caraites* and *Sadducees* of old, to be the more *Orthodox Divines* among the *Jews*; and moreover hold with (h) *Dr. Lightfoot*, for whom I have more Charity than to suspect of Infidelity, that the *Jewish Cabalistical Converts* infected Christianity with their deadly and unprofitable Allegories; that is, corrupted the Apostles and Fathers of the Church with their mystical and typical Theology. If so; farewell to Christianity, and of consequence, to all Religion.

(g) *Discourse of the Grounds*, p. 81, 90, 118,

(h) *Of the Fall of Jerusalem*, Sect. 10.

And though the *Bishop of Litchfield* inconsiderately (i) says, that he is not concern'd to vindicate the *Antiquity* ascrib'd by Philo, to the allegorick way of Writing, much less the Abuse it was carry'd to by after-Ages, no, nor to defend at all this manner of Writing; yet I am sure he is obliged to it, or it is impossible to write a good *Defence of Christianity*. And if he, or some others of better Abilities, do not do it, before I undertake it my self, I will exhibit such an Accusation against the *Clergy* of this Age, for *Apostacy*, and even for *Infidelity* too, if they may be charg'd with the Consequence of their Opinions, as they shall not be able to acquit themselves of. It is then of the first Importance, to contend for the Opinion of the Fathers and antient *Jews*, that the *Cabalistical Theology*, or allegorical way of Interpretation of the Law, was derived from *Moses* (for which I have Demonstration enough on a proper Occasion to be produced) and, if but according to it, we can prove the Law prophetic of the Gospel, or our *Jesus*, in his *Oeconomy*, a Prophet like to *Moses*, we shall then establish *Christianity* on its sure Foundation, and re-

(i) *Defence of Christianity*, p. 345.

store *Antiquity* to her rightful Chair of Authority. And I don't doubt but the Man that does this, will be the Converter of *Jews* and *Infidels*, and like a Conqueror, ride in a triumphal Chariot over the false Gods and *false Christs* of the Universe, which being bound in Parabolical *Chains*, will be led as *Captives* to him.

This then is a farther Encouragement to the Study of the allegorical, mystical, and prophetical Sense of the Scriptures, for a Proof of the *Messiahship* of *Jesus*. But you'll ask here, Where must we begin to expound *all Things that are written in the Law, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning our Jesus?* I answer, where the Holy *Jesus*, who is the Divine *Logos*, upon his spiritual Resurrection out of the Grave of the *Letter*, will direct us, and that is, *to begin with Moses*, and then proceed to the *Prophets*, and so expound the Things concerning himself. Or as it is *St. Augustin's* (k) Opinion, we must begin this mystical and allegorical Exposition, with the Deliverance of the *Israelites* out of *Egypt*. We must *open our Mouths in Parables*, that is, in the Parabolical Hi-

(k) Vid. August. in Ps. 77.

story of that *Egyptian* Deliverance, and apply it to the History of the Redemption of *Christ's* Church from *Gentile* Idolatry, and the persecuting and harden'd Hearts of the *Emperors* of *Rome*. We must declare and illustrate *Enigma's* of old, such as we may see by open Vision, and such as we have heard of from our *Fathers*, who have told us of them, to the Intent that Posterity might be inform'd of the Wonders that God did for the primitive Church, after the manner he had done before for old *Israel*. You know, *Sirs*, I am both able and willing to assist you in this Work; and if you and I together, upon the concurrent Testimony of *Jews* and *Fathers* (History, Civil and Ecclesiastical, all along supporting us) do *this clearly*, we shall open and prepare the Way for the mystical and allegorical Interpretation of the rest of the Law and the Prophets, in such a manner as the *Author of the Discourse*, &c. must yield to, and which must of Necessity subdue and conquer him upon his own Principles. Though it was *Faustus's* Opinion and Objection, that our *Jesus* was not at all a Prophet like *Moses*, yet I question not, but we shall show they bear a Resemblance to each other, as Face answereth to Face in a Glass: And though
the

the (l) *Author of the Discourse*, &c. as well as *Celsus* and *Porphiry*, may be of Opinion, that the two Testaments, of the *Letter*, and of the *Spirit*, are not by allegorical Interpretations to be reconcil'd to each other; yet I doubt not, but we shall demonstrate them to be like a *Pair of Indentures*, that in all Points correspond to one another. And though you, *Sirs*, may be dishearten'd with the Apprehensions of the Difficulty, and even Impossibility of such a Demonstration, yet, I say, fear not, and in time you may receive the Pleasure and Satisfaction *Origen* (m) speaks of, of beholding, and of contemplating on the Harmony and Agreement between them.

What then should hinder you, *Sirs*, from taking this Method, which is so cogent, proper, and convincing with your Adversary? There is indeed a Lett and Impediment or two in the Way, but I am ashamed to mention them before *Scholars*, *Christians*, and *Philosophers*, who are or should be such Lovers of Truth, and of their Religion, as to be ready to lay down

(l) Page 172, 173, 174.

(m) Jucundum est istum Consensum intelligere circa convenientia duorum Testamentorum. *In. Mass. Tract. 6.*
their

their Lives, much more their secular Interests for it. But whether you will take my Advice, and accept of my Assistance, or not ; yet, if you write any more against the *Author of the Discourse*, &c. let me beg of you to take these Cautions and Admonitions along with you.

First, That you accuse him no more of writing (i) *without Learning*, and with but (o) *little Learning*, as some of you do, till you can make good your Accusation, and discover more Learning in your Oppositions to him. He is certainly a most learned and ingenious Gentleman. He has rightly and strenuously attack'd the Truth of Christianity, which you are not able to defend. He has batter'd the Church with her own Armour, and beaten her sacerdotal Guards with their own Weapons. His Performance bespeaks great Art, and much Industry ; whilst your Replies, for the most part, consist of Gibberish and Impertinence. If you, any of you, had manifested any good Reading in your *Answers*, or had contend'd with him upon equal Reason and Authority, I should not have

(n) Lavington *Of the Nature and Use of a Type*, in his Preface, p. 4.

(o) *Newcome*, in the Dedication of his Sermon.

pass'd this Censure: But, as the Case stands, I should be an unjust *Moderator*, If I had not given you this Reproof. Your Charge, *Sirs*, against him, *for want of Learning*, is as graceless, as that of an impudent *Bawd's* accusing a most virtuous and modest *Virgin* of repeated Fornications; and I was put to the Blush at the reading of such a senseless and groundless Calumny. In short, the Second Part of the *Author's Discourse* in Vindication of our *Bible*, against Mr. *Whiston's Essay*, is so curious, learned, and elaborate, that I question whether it can be equal'd by any *Doctor* of the Church. Whether the Clergy think of giving him publick Thanks for it, I can't tell; but he is more deserving of them, than was the *Earl of N——*, for his *Defence of the Doctrine of the Trinity*: And I hope the two *Universities* will take it into Consideration, especially *Cambridge*, and pay that Respect which is due to a most learned *Gentleman*, who was once a *Member* of, and is now an *Honour* to her Body.

Secondly, I observe, *Sirs*, you charge the *Author of the Discourse* (p) with Malice,

(p) *Lavington* in Preface to the *Nature of a Type*, p. 4 and

and for being a Scoffer, and call his Treatise (q) a *grave Piece of Buffoonry*. Wherefore is all this foul Language? Because an ingenious Gentleman labours under some Doubts about the Truth of Christianity, which the weak Arguments of its Advocates, and their other Absurdities and Contradictions have occasion'd; and because, like other *Controvertists* in Religion, he takes the Liberty to propose his Doubts and Objections from the *Press*, in order for Satisfaction in them; is he therefore to be accused of *Malice*? And because he artfully disguises his Infidelity, to avoid giving Offence to weak Brethren of a blind and implicit Faith; is he therefore to be accused of writing a *grave Piece of Buffoonry*? And because he pleasantly diverts himself and his Readers, with the Impertinence of *Boylean Lectures*, and of other Theological *Scriblers*, is he therefore to be accounted a *Scoffer*? There is no Reason in all this; which an impartial Reader will turn to the Disadvantage of the *Clergy*, and conclude it an Argument of the Badness of their Cause, or of their Impotency for the Defence of it, or they would not have Recourse to such foul Language.

(q) *Newcome* in the Dedication of his Sermon.

There are indeed too many Instances to be given of *malicious* Writers, among our Polemical *Divines*, who more than any Men of another Craft, bear a Spite against one another. Some *Authors* of high Station in the Church, had never been, with that Bitterness of Stile, written against, if they had not been envy'd in their Preferments : And it is well known, that the Priesthood of this Age are such a Generation of *Vipers*, that, were they not restrain'd by the Civil Authority, would, through *Malice*, be biting and devouring one another. But the *Author of the Discourse* can't possibly bear any *Malice* to God and Religion, nor even to the *Clergy*, unless their Haughtiness and ill Usage of him sometimes may have disoblig'd, and provok'd him to it.

And there are *Buffoons*, mere *Buffoons* too, among the *Writers* of the Church. I forbear to mention them : But if Mr. *Newcome* had known what it was to act the Buffoon in Controversy, he would have pass'd by the *Author of the Discourse*, and have thought of them.

But a *Scoffer*, forsooth, is the *Author of the Discourse* call'd ; and one of the *Writers* against him thinks himself witty for saying, that he who writes against Prophecy, has fulfill'd that of St. Peter, who
says

says, that in the last Days shall come *Scoffers*. But let me tell him, that St. *Peter* speaks not of Infidels, but of *Apostates*, who, being departed from the primitive Doctrine of the Spirit of the Law, will *scoff* at the Revival of it; and it will be well, if some *Clergymen* ben't found greater *Scoffers*, Revilers, and Blasphemers of the Spirit of Prophecy, than the *Author of the Discourse* is, or can be.

Thirdly, A certain *Three-penny Writer* of a *Letter* to the *Author of the Discourse*, who subscribes himself a *Divine of the Church of England*, says to him (r) thus, "If you will promise, that if there be
 " any farther Correspondence between us,
 " you'll behave your self more like a *Man*,
 " more like a *Person of moral Honesty and*
 " *Integrity*, but especially more like a
 " *Gentleman, a Scholar, and a Philosopher*,
 " and keep close to the Argument, and
 " leave out every Thing that is foreign to
 " it, I will draw up what seems to me a
 " conclusive Proof of the Truth of the
 " Christian Religion, and publish it as
 " soon as conveniently may be." Wherefore is all this *Ribaldry, Random-shot*, and

Billingsgate Language? The *Author of the Discourse* has shewn himself to be a *Scholar*, and a *Philosopher*; to whom this *Three-penny Writer*, for any Thing appears in his *Letter*, is not comparable. And though he may draw up and publish before *Latter Lammas*, somewhat, that in his own Conceit, may seem a conclusive Proof of the Truth of the Christian Religion; yet for want of Sense, Reason, and Argument in it, it will never be thought such, in the penetrating Judgment of the *Author of the Discourse*. Moreover, as I hear, the *Author of the Discourse* is unquestionably a *Gentleman of moral Honesty and Integrity* in his Dealings and Conversation in the World (which can't be said of many *Priests*) neither is his *Integrity and Honesty* to be call'd into Question upon his *Discourse of the Grounds*, &c. unless it can be proved that he has wilfully falsified in his Quotations; which none have attempted. Such a *Reflection* then, upon a *Gentleman* of his Worth, is very provoking; and was he not a *Philosopher*, and even more of a *Christian*, than the *Writer* of this *Three-penny Letter*, he would resent it, and give him Chastisement; which, if it was executed upon him with some Severity, would be no Infringement of that

Free-

[III]

Freedom of Debate, which the *Author of the Discourse* contends for.

Fourthly, The Writer of a Pamphlet, call'd, *The Christian Religion not founded on Allegory*, says, the *Author of the Discourse* is (s) an *Enemy to all Religion*, and consequently a common *Enemy to Mankind*. What's this for? to incense the Civil Magistrate against him, and to raise the Ecclesiastical *Mob* upon him, as if he was no more to be endured in human Society, than a *Wolf* among *Sheep*; or in the Neighbourhood of the *Clergy*, than a *Fox* near *Geese*? Whether the *Author of the Discourse* be not as good a Friend to human Society, as any of the *Clergy* about him, I appeal to his Neighbours, and to others, who have the Honour and Happiness of his Acquaintance and Conversation. It is indeed the common *Topick* of Preachers, that *Atheism* and Infidelity are pernicious to the *Welfare of Mankind*; but all that they have hitherto preach'd and printed on this Head, does not amount to a Proof, that even *Atheists* would not be for forming themselves into a regular Society, and for enacting of Laws for the happy and

peaceable Government of it. And it is true on the other Hand, that Religion, true Religion, tends to the Happiness of Mankind, even in this World; but then it must be of another Sort, than has been profess'd by the *Priests*, of whatsoever Denomination, for many Ages past; who, by their furious and blind Zeal for *Church* and *Holy Cause*, have overturned Governments, created Factions, increas'd Strife, and occasions Wars and Blood-shed, to the havock and destruction of Mankind. There is nothing more notorious, than that the *Priesthood* is the most cruel, ferocious, and outrageous Part of the Creation; and were they not ridden by the Civil Authority, as a *blind Horse* of much Mettal is, with a strait Rein, and strong Hand, would be running at all, trampling upon their Neighbours, and committing Devastation and *Waste*. The very worst that can be said of the *Author of the Discourse*, is, that he is for curing Mankind of a false and blind Zeal for Religion, and for preventing the unhappy Effects of it for the future. No doubt, but he is for good and wholesom Laws, for the Conservation of the publick Peace and Welfare; which may be made effectual without the other Ties of Religion, unless they had visibly greater Obli-

Obligation upon the *Priest's*, as well as the *People's* Conscience, than they now seem to have.

Fifthly, Mr. *Whiston* says of a certain Gentleman, the supposed *Author of the Discourse*, that he is guilty of (t) *gross Immorality, impious Fraud, and Lay Craft*, for receiving the Sacrament according to the *Church of England*, &c. to qualify himself for the *Commission of Peace*. This is a heavy Charge, and is as foolish, unreasonable, and scandalous, as any of the former. What could Mr. *W.* have said worse of the most fraudulent Practice of the most notorious *Knave*? In Charity to Mr. *W.* I imagine these *froward Words* proceeded from his rash Passion, void of Consideration (as he is not a Man without Fire in his Temper) rather than from his deliberate Thoughts and Judgment. I am not to write a Vindication of that Gentleman's Occasional Conformity, which he can do better for himself: And if he can't justify his Conduct in this Case, in his own way of Writing, upon the Example of *Joseph's* Conformity to (u) *the establish'd Church of Egypt*; yet he may say much

(t) Proposals for Printing by Subscription, *Authentick Records*, &c. p. 16.

(u) Page 22.

in Extenuation and Mitigation of his *Fault*; and to shew that, if it be at all a *Fault*, it is deserving of a much softer Name, than that of an *impious Fraud*, and *gross Immorality*. But what is it that this *Gentleman* does, which Mr. *W.* gives these *hard Words* to? Nothing worse than comply with the Command of the Civil Authority, in a Thing which is harmless in it self, for the Service of his King and Country. And if he have not the same Taste of the Bread and Wine at the Communion, which *Papists*, or *Lutherans*, or *Calvinists* have, how can he help it? The Palates of Mens *Souls* are as different as the Palates of their *Mouths*. And if he receive not the Eucharistical Elements with that Devotion some *Lay-men* do, yet he does with as much as some *Priests* who consecrate them, and have been shrewdly suspected of Infidelity. Does not Mr. *Whiston* know, that the like Practice with this Gentleman, or rather a much worse one, is the Fashion of the Age we live in, but never was so exclaim'd against in any others? Does he not know, that our rigid Dissenters are occasional Communicants for a Place of Trust and Profit, who at other Times, for Conscience sake, will not enter our Church Doors? And though this their Hypocrisy has been often spoken of in *Print*, yet never

ver was inveigh'd against in the like reproachful Terms : And let any one judge, where lies the greatest Sin, whether in the Dissenting *Prevaricator*, or in the *Author of the Discourse*, upon Principle? Does not Mr. W. know, that his *Arianiz'd* Friends of the *Clergy*, subscribe to the Articles of our Church, &c. for Preferment, which is such *impious Fraud* and *Prevarication*, that the *Author of the Discourse*, I believe, detests and abhors? Does not Mr. W. know, that all the *Clergy*, one with another, or upon one Occasion or other, take *Oaths* against Principle, but would not like to be branded with the odious Name of *gross Immoralists* for it? And what does this Gentleman, the *Author of the Discourse*, do, in receiving the Sacrament, that is comparably so bad? Why must he be so shot at for a *little* Dissimulation, and the *Clergy* spared for a much greater? Mr. W. should have excused the *Author of the Discourse*, upon Consideration of such Practices in the *Clergy*; which, in all probability, are some Occasion of his Infidelity : For, besides his Penetration into the Invalidity of their Arguments for the Truth of Christianity, he may reasonably be scandaliz'd at their irreligious Compliances against Principle, and suspect them of *Scepticism* at least, or they would not

be guilty of them. If then the *Author of the Discourse*, &c. upon an Occasion appear like a *Christian* at Church, as the Clergy at other Times do like *Infidels* out of it; who, I pray, is the greatest Sinner, guilty of the most *impious Fraud*, and *grosslest Immorality*? But,

Sixthly, and *Lastly*, whatever you say, *Sirs*, of the *Author of the Discourse* in *Print*, to his Disreputation and Disadvantage, let me beg of you to raise no *false Reports* of him in common Talk and Conversation. It was commonly reported of him, upon the coming forth of *Mr. Whiston's Literal Accomplishments of Scripture Prophecies*, as I had it from *Mr. Cotterel of Ansley*, that he was ashamed of the *Discourse of the Grounds*, and had disown'd it. I am persuaded this is a notorious Falshood (*Priest-Craft in Perfection*) wilfully rais'd, for the Service of that Cause you are not able to defend with your Pens. Tho' I am unacquainted with the *Author of the Discourse*, &c. yet I believe him so far from being convinced by *Mr. Whiston's Book*, that he does but laugh at it, as I do. And if none of you can perform better in the Interpretation and Application of Prophecies than *Mr. W.* the said Gentleman

tleman is like to persist in his Infidelity.

These are some of the Faults that I observe in you, *Sirs*, in the Management of this Controversy ; which I hope you'll avoid for the future, if you proceed in it. It is commonly observ'd, that where there's much *Railing*, there's little *Reason* ; and it's reckon'd the Sign of the Badness of a Cause, or of the Weakness of its Advocates, when they have Recourse to foul Language in Defence of it. The *Author of the Discourse* writes like a *Gentleman*, as well as *Scholar*. He has not given the *Clergy*, or our modern Defenders of Christianity one ill Word, unless they can think him to *ironize*, when he confers on them the *Epithets* of *Reverend* and *Learned*. Though he *bites* hard and close sometimes, yet he never *barks* nor *snarls* ; and I am sorry to see so much of the *canine* and oblatrative Nature in any of his *Clerical* Opponents.

But some will object to me here, and wonder that I, of all Men, can upbraid the *Clergy* with this Fault, when I have given them in my *Free Gifts*, the most opprobrious Language that ever was bestow'd on them. I confess it, and if I had nothing to say in my Excuse, I would own it
to

to be an unpardonable Crime. One Reason why I treated the *Clergy* with such ill Words, was to provoke them to Combat, giving them thereby an Handle to lay hold on, by way of Opposition, when I, having manifestly the Advantage of them in Argument, was sure good Words would not move them. But after all, I was cautious, that I gave them no worse Language than they deserved, or than, consistently with the Laws of Christianity, is justifiable. I have been privately, by a Friend, admonish'd of that Fault, and I know the Clergy, in Conversation, have aggravated it to the last Degree. But I could not have wish'd for a better *Apology* for my self, than what the *Writers* against the *Author of the Discourse*, in the Instances above, have publish'd. If they can vindicate themselves in the Use of the ill Words given to him, or if I don't defend my self for what I have said of them, if they please to make the Experiment by Controversy, then I will plead Guilty, and acknowledge my self the worst Writer for Scandal and Slander, that ever took Pen in Hand.

But all this, you'll say, is but finding Fault still. Why don't I, or I am an unjust *Moderator*, take Notice of the Beauty of your Thoughts, the Goodness of the
Autho-

Authorities, and the Strength of the Arguments used in all, or at least in some of your Writings against your Adversary? I own, I should be an unfair *Moderator*, if I should not observe what is commendable, as well as blame-worthy in you: Or if I should omit to mention any thing I can, to your Honour, in this Controversy. But I must declare, all the Pieces I have seen against your *Adversary*, whether taken together or a-part, are mere *Engastromuthism*, consisting of crude and undigested Notions, without the good Savour of Reason and Authority.

The most *bulky* Writer against the *Author of the Discourse*, is the *Bishop of Lichfield*, whose first Part of his *Defence of Christianity*, consists of a Proof of the Expectation, which the World, in the Time of our *Jesus*, had of a *Messiah*, or of a victorious Prince out of the *East*, to rule the World, and reign in Grandeur. This Proof takes up *Seventy-four* Pages, which I will not lose Time to make Remarks on: The *Author of the Discourse* neither does, nor will deny, the World was then in Expectation of a *Messiah*; but he will say, it was of a Temporal, and not of a Spiritual Prince; consequently that Expectation is so far from making for the *Messiahship* of our *Jesus*, that it will be well,

well, if the *Author of the Discourse* don't turn it to his Disadvantage, and covertly insinuate, that our *Jesus* was deservedly put to Death for an *Impostor*, a *Stirrer* up of Sedition, and a vain *Pretender* to a Title and Character which did not belong to him.

The following Pages of the *Bishop's* Book, to *Numb.* 264, consist of a Collection of Types and Prophecies out of the Old Testament, of his Application of them to our *Jesus*, and of the Arguments of his being the Messiah from them. It is not my Business to take any of the said Types and Prophecies into Examination, and to shew the Pertinency or Impertinence of the *Bishop's* Application of them unto our *Jesus*. Let the *Author of the Discourse* do this, if he thinks fit. But there is one of the *Bishop's* Prophecies so obvious and plain, that I wish he had insisted on *that* only, and had publish'd it by it self, with his learn'd Comments, in a *Penny Pamphlet*, which might have saved *him* the Consumption of much Time, Ink, and Paper; and *me* the Trouble and Charge of buying and reading his more voluminous Work. The Prophecy I mean, is that of *Zech. ix. 9.* Rejoice greatly, O Daughter of Sion, shout, O Daughter of Jerusalem; Behold thy King cometh unto thee, the righteous

teous one, and that Saviour, lowly, and riding upon an *Afs*, and upon a Colt, the Fole of an *Afs*. It is mighty well observ'd of the *Bishop*, that the antient (w) *Jews* understood this Text as a Prophecy of the *Messiah*; and "how it was a Custom with them, to fix deeply a Remembrance of his Coming, at the Paschal Feast, for one to personate the *Messias*, to burst open the Door suddenly, and to ride into the Room upon an *Afs*, and another like *Elias*, to go after him with a Horn, to proclaim and anoint him, and this to represent how the *Messias* shall enter into *Jerusalem*." After this the *Bishop* very notably (x) says, "Let them (the unbelieving *Jews* or Infidels) fancy what they will, the *Jews*, in *Jesus Christ's* Time, knew but of one *Messiah*, and to him they apply'd this Text of *Zachary*. For *Jesus's* going up to *Jerusalem* upon an *Afs*, at his last Passover, to ease and defend himself from the Crowd that follow'd him—made them strait conclude (the People being struck with this Circumstance of his Entry) he must be the *Messias*." For, as he goes on, "Seeing him equipt

(w) *Defence of Christianity*, p. 105.

(x) *Ibid.* p. 106.

“ like *Zachary's Messias*, they thought
 “ him to be no other than the King, that
 “ Saviour whom they expected also at
 “ the Feast of the Passover. After what
 “ had been thus said (*in Hosannas and*
 “ *Acclamations*) and own'd by the *Jews*,
 “ who can with any Face question the
 “ *Evangelist* for observing upon this Acti-
 “ on of *Jesus*, that so it was fulfill'd,
 “ which was spoken by the Prophet *Za-*
 “ *chary*?

If this Prophecy, with its Completion,
 will not convince the *Author of the Dis-*
course, what will? As the *Bishop* reasons
 remarkably, so I wish he had a little more
 display'd his Eloquence in a lively Repre-
 sentation of that famous Cavalcade at
Jesus's thus entring into *Jerusalem*, be-
 cause I am afraid the *Author of the Dis-*
course has but a mean *Idea* of *Jesus*, a
 poor Man, *without Form or Comeliness*, his
 riding upon two ill-favour'd Beasts, a-
 midst the Acclamations and Huzzas of a
 rude and mobbish Crew. This joyful Tri-
 umph and Commencement of *Jesus's*
 Reign, was soon turn'd into Mourning, for
 he was crucified a few Days after: And if
 it may not be question'd, whether the same
 People, because of the mutability of their
 Affections, were not as warm with their
Outcries for his Crucifixion, as they were
 before

before with their *Hosannas*, yet it is reasonable to think, that *that* his, somewhat like, seditious Entrance into *Jerusalem*, hasten'd that sad and tragical *Catastrophe* of his Life, and short Reign. I have no Mind to write, what some modern *Divines*, of a blind Faith, would call *impiously*; otherwise I could argue from St. *Jerome*, (y) the *Turpitude* and *Impossibility* of that triumphal Entrance of *Jesus* into *Jerusalem*, as it is recorded by the Evangelists: But the *Author of the Discourse*, I dare say, is aware of the Argument. Moreover, he knows how to object against such literal Prophecies, and literal Accomplishments, because such Prophecies, in their Completions, are subject to Counterfeit; and a false *Messiah*, as well as the Holy *Jesus*, might have acted his Part in that mock Triumph: And withal, he can excellently reason for the Necessity of the (z) *Obscurity* of Oracles before their Completion. What then must we do for the Honour of *Zachary's* and the *Bishop's* Prophecy before us? Why, we must betake our selves to the Opinion of the antient *Jews* and Fathers,

(y) Ergo quoniam Historia vel Impossibilitatem, vel Turpitudinem habeat, ad altiora transmittimur. *In Matt.* cap. 21.

(z) Page 44, 45.

who held *Zachary's* Prophecy in Hand to be but a Parable, and that the *Ass*, as well as the *Daughter of Sion*, were symbolical. Neither did the (a) Fathers otherwise consider the Entrance of *Jesus* into *Jerusalem*, than as a Type and Figure of his more glorious and future Entry into that spiritual and holy City, when the Church will be transform'd into an *Ass*, for *Jesus's* Use and Riding: And she ought not to disdain such a *Metamorphosis* and Transformation of her self for *Jesus's* Use, since she has transfigured him into a (b) *Bull* for her own Riding, for many Ages past. And when the Holy *Jesus*, or Divine *Logos* of the Law, shall be mounted on his *Ass* of the Church, for his glorious Expedition to the new *Jerusalem*, amidst the Allelujahs of the Saints; then will *Elias* be his *Prodromus*, riding on her winching

(a) Gestorum effectibus prophetatur, ——— omnis autem hæc species futuri Ordinem tenet, & parabolicis significationibus Rerumque præsentium Conditionibus, futuris forma permittitur. Erit enim Dominus in Claritatis suæ adventu Gentes possidens, earumque Mentis tanquam Vector insidens. *Hilar. in Matt. Cap. 21.* Plenum Mysterii est, quod *Assellus* est adductus Domino. Populus mitis & mansuetus portans bene Dominum *assellus* est & tendit ad *Jerusalem*. *Augustin in Ps. 31. Sect. 23.*

(b) Revel. xvii. 3, 7.

and unruly *Colt* (c) of the Clergy, and, with the Spirit of Prophecy, sounding the *Kegajwas* (d) Horns of the Parables or Enigma's of the Law, in the Audience of the Apprehensions of the People; and there will ensue such a splendid Feast on the Mysteries of God's Word, as never was celebrated at the Nuptials or Inauguration of the greatest Prince. So then the *Talmudists*, as above, were orthodox in their symbolical Representation of the coming of the *Messiah*; and the *Bishop* alone was mistaken in his *carnal* Conceptions of what they meant mystically; and forgot to prove that *Elias* blew a Horn, like a *Post-Boy*, before or after our *Jesus*, at his *Asinine* Entrance into *Jerusalem*, which was of the Essence of his Completion of the forefald cabalistical Emblem and Memorial of his Advent.

In the next Place, the *Bishop* of *Lichfield*, from Page 265, to 340, of his *Defence of Christianity*, has taken to task the *Five* remarkable Prophecies of the Old

(c) *Pullus lascivus & Frænorum impatiens non uno Errori & Dogmati subditus. Hieron. in Matt. cap. xxi. 5.*

(d) *Quæ sint autem Buccinæ cornex? Qui de cælestibus loquitur, qui de spiritalibus differit, qui mysteria Regni Cælorum revelat, ille Buccina cornea concinit. Origen. in Lib. Judic. C. 7. Hom. 9.*

Testament, which are cited by the *Evangelists*, and which the *Author of the Discourse* seems to ridicule. How well he has perform'd on this Head, let others judge. I, in Respect to the Character and Reputation of a *Bishop*, will here make none of those Animadversions, which any one may reasonably think I can. But I can't forbear taking Notice of what he (e) says, how
 “ some of great Learning and Judgment
 “ have been of Opinion, that the two
 “ first Chapters of St. Matthew, (*in which*
 “ *are some of these controverted Prophe-*
 “ *cies*) were not in the Nazarene Gospel,
 “ to which St. Matthew's Hebrew Copy is
 “ supposed to have been conformable; and
 “ that if this could be made out, it would
 “ deliver us at once of the chief Difficul-
 “ ties laid in the way of Christianity, by
 “ the Adversary.” Whether the *Bishop*, who a little before acknowledges (f) *these two Chapters* to be part of St. Matthew's Gospel, does, for the determination of this Dispute, wish them to be spurious, and that somebody or other would make it out, I can't tell: Neither can I guess what he means by these (g) *poor weeping Sayings*,

(e) Page 266.

(f) Ibid. p. 266.

(g) Ibid. 266.

“ Nothing considerable is built on these
 “ Quotations : No Consequences of Im-
 “ portance are drawn from them. Had
 “ they been all omitted, Christianity would
 “ stand as firm upon its Bottom, as with
 “ them.” But one would have thought,
 that the *Bishop* should have look’d upon
 the said Quotations out of the Old Testa-
 ment to be prophetical, if they had not
 been referr’d to by *St. Matthew* ; or I
 know not upon what Authority he grounds
 his own Collection of Prophecies, which
 are not to be met with in our Evangelical
 and Apostolical Writings.

After this, from Page 340, to 393, the
Bishop treats of the allegorick Methods of
 citing Scripture, used by the Writers of the
 New Testament, on which he talks in a
 Way by himself, shoots at Random, and
 dissents from primitive Authority, without
 disproving it, or so much as knowing it.
 If I should enter upon Remarks here, I
 should ne’er have done. But what gives
 me great Offence, is the *Bishop’s* Assertions
 of *St. Paul*, viz. “ That (b) he suffer’d
 “ in the Esteem of the *Jewish* Christians
 “ for a Neglect of Allegories, and seems
 “ to be brought into the Use of them,

(b) Page 347.

“ against

“ against his own good Liking. *And again he says,* “ (i) It seems to have been “ in Compliance with the *Jewish* Christi- “ ans, who were affected with allegorick “ Interpretations, that *St. Paul*, above all “ the other Apostles, used that Way.” What could the *Author of the Discourse*, or any other Infidel have said worse to the Dishonour of *St. Paul*? These Expressions of the *Bishop* are no less false than they are abusive. They not only make *St. Paul* a weak, if not a worse Man; but are a Reflection on that Divine Spirit which conducted *St. Paul* in his Ministry. If *St. Paul* was brought into the Use of Allegories against his own good liking, then was he a Minister of the Spirit of the Law against his Will, and it was not God, but *Man*, that made him to be an able Minister of the New Testament: The Consequence of which is, that *St. Paul* corrupted Christianity with false Doctrine, to please the People; which I abhor the Thoughts of. In short, the *Bishop's* Expressions before us, seem to me so inconsiderate and precipitate, that I wish, if he write any more in this Controversy, he would be so kind as to let us know upon what Reason and Au-

thority he asserts, that *St. Paul* suffer'd in the Esteem of the Jewish Christians, for his Neglect of Allegories, when it is most manifest that *St. Paul* was a profess'd Allegorist, as appears not only from his Writings, but from the Opinion of the Fathers, who follow his Example, and urge his Authority for their allegorical Interpretations. I wish also the *Bishop* would tell us, what induced him to say, that *St. Paul* was brought into the Use of Allegories, against his own good liking, when his Epistle to the Hebrews, in the Opinion of the Jews as well as Fathers, bespeaks him to be an excellent Cabalist; which no Man could or would be, without his own Approbation and good Liking of that Science. If the *Bishop* do not well account for himself in this Case, I shall think his Expressions above, the most disgustful and unfavoury of any, that ever dropp'd from the Pen of one of his Order. Though the *Author of the Discourse* has now and then a Fling at the Wisdom of *St. Paul*; yet it is always so genteely cover'd under a Trope, that many English Readers can hardly see through it: But the *Bishop's* Abuse of the Apostle, in his Expressions before us, is so blunt and gross, that there is scarcely a poor Vicar and Curate of the Diocese of Coventry and

Lichfield so dull, as not to discern it, and cry, Shame of it. But,

Lastly, The *Bishop*, in the Conclusion of his Book, argues, that the Sense given by Christ and his Apostles, to the Prophecies of the Old Testament, is certainly to be preferr'd to any other possible Sense of the Prophecies; which he endeavours to prove from their Miracles, &c. I have no more to answer in this Case, than if the *Author of the Discourse* has no great Opinion of the Miracles of *Jesus* and his Apostles, nor will, without better Reason, pay any more Regard to their Sense and Authority, than to the *Ipse Dixit* of a Philosopher of the *Gentiles*, I can't help it.

These are a few Observations I have made on the *Bishop's* Book, for which I expect his Thanks and Compliments. If he mistake my Meaning, and think that such a large Work, as is his *Defence of Christianity*, might have afforded more and more curious Remarks, I will take another Opportunity to make him Amends, in some farther Animadversions upon it.

But I must not forget to thank the *Bishop* for his Rabbinical Quotations, which sometime or other I may make more Use of,

of, to his or my own Advantage, if they are faithful Translations; I say, if they are *faithful* Translations; and I should not have question'd his Integrity in this Case, if he had not been very faulty in a Misrepresentation of the Words and Sense of the *Author of the Discourse*; for which, without my producing of Instances, I leave him to the Expostulation of that *Gentleman*. When I had gone through the *Bishop's* Work, and consider'd how curiously it was deck'd and adorn'd with *Hebrew* Words and Letters, which bespeak his great Sense and Learning, it brought to my Mind the Observation of *Botanists*, that *all Sorts of Plants will not thrive in all Soils*; from whence I inferr'd, that the Bishop's Wit and Genius, like a certain Soil, is peculiarly adapted to the Growth and Improvement of *Hebrew* Roots, as mine is for *Mysteries*. But so much at present for the *Bishop of Lichfield*.

The next Writer of Note, against the *Author of the Discourse*, is Dr. Clark, Rector of St. James's Westminster, who to this Purpose, has publish'd a *Discourse concerning the Connexion of the Prophecies of the Old Testament*, &c. Considering his Name and Fame, I did not expect such a Discourse from him. If I was not fully satisfied of his Piety and Integrity, I

should have suspected some latent and ill Design in it. Whether Dr. *Clark* has read the Fathers, and observ'd their Opinions of the Writings of *Moses* and the Prophets, of the Nature of Oracles, and of the way of Interpretation of them, I can't tell: But if he has, it's plain he does not understand them, or disregards their Authority; otherwise he would never have publish'd such a *Fumble* and *Bundle* of Prophecies, and apply'd them in the Fashion he has done. As Dr. *Clark* enters not into the Merits of the Controversy before us, I will not go out of my Way, to make any Remarks on his Prophecies: But desire him to take into Consideration again his (k) Assertion, that *Some Applications of Texts out of the Old Testament, are mere Allusions*; and also his Gloss on the Evangelical Sayings, *that it might be fulfill'd which was spoken by the Prophet, &c.* by which he seems to hint, that the *Evangelist* means no more than we do, when we say, *the old Proverb is made good, or verified*: Just as if I should say of Dr. *Clark*, that he has verified or fulfilled the *Adage* of the Antients, saying, *Ex quovis Ligno non fit Mercurius*; that is, every Philo-

sopher is not fit to make an *Egum*, or Interpreter of Divine Oracles. Whatever Dr. Clark may think, such a Perversion of the Evangelical Phrases, is destructive of the very Essence of Prophecy; and we may as well account the Writings of *Plato*, as of *Moses* and the Prophets, prophetic, if we can but *allusively* refer to them.

When I consider the Collection of Prophecies out of the Old Testament, that Dr. Clark, the Bishop of *Lichfield*, Mr. *Whiston*, and others, have severally made, and their Application of them after their own Fancies; I can't but wish that a considerable Number of such great Men, as suppose in *Convocation*, were to meet, and make a complete System out of *Moses* and the Prophets, of all they think typical and prophetic of the Life, Church, and Kingdom of the *Messias*; for they don't believe what the Fathers and I do, that the whole, from the beginning of *Genesis*, to the end of *Malachy*, is Type and Prophecy: Then, without disputing their way of Application of their collected Prophecies, I would ask them these Questions; What we must do with, or think of the rest of the Writings of *Moses* and the Prophets, that are not in their Judgment typical and prophetic? Why *Moses*, and the Prophets,

phets, did not distinguish between the prophetic and unprophetic Parts of their Scriptures? Or why our Saviour, and his Apostles, did not ascertain this Distinction, but left it for them to make it? By what *Criterion* they know this or that Text or Sentence to be prophetic? Whether it will not be possible for me, or some others, to show many of their prophetic and unprophetic Passages of the Old Testament, so inseparably connected together, that it's impossible to separate them, without maiming the Sense in both Cases? Whether the Number of Prophecies, notwithstanding their determinate Opinion about them, will not be always uncertain, and more or less, according to the Fancy of every Christian Reader? And *Lastly*, What is the Reason that the Fathers, about Prophecies, and their way of Interpretation, are disregarded; and whether it has not been of ill Consequence to the Peace of the Church, and Truth of Christianity, to depart from their Opinions? When Dr. *Clark* can give me a satisfactory Answer to these Questions, I will subscribe to his collected Number of Prophecies, as soon as to any Man's; and only reserve to my self a Liberty to contest the Application of them; in which such as he, the *Bishop of Lichfield*, and Mr. *Whiston*, will make me

Work

Work enough. In the mean time I entertain the Opinion of the antient *Jews* and *Fathers*, which too I do, because I am able to demonstrate it, that the Old Testament is entirely typical and prophetical of the New, or of the Kingdom of the *Messiah*; but is otherwise to be open'd, interpreted, and apply'd, than *Dr. Clark* is aware of: In Respect to whom, I forbear to make such farther Animadversions on his *Connexion of the Prophecies of the Old Testament*, as I can do: But it will be well for him, if the *Author of the Discourse*, &c. as he is of sufficient Learning and Abilities, don't do it.

The very best Passages of all the Writers against the *Author of the Discourse*, &c. are those of *Mr. Lavington*, who says, that (1) his (the *Author of the Discourse's*) first, and almost only true Position is this, that Christianity is founded on *Judaism*, or the *New Testament on the Old*.—— And that *Christ and his Apostles*, in their *Writings and Discourses*, ground and prove Christianity from the *Old Testament*, or from the *Accomplishment of the Prophecies of the Old Testament by the New*. And

(1) Of the Nature and Use of a Type, in Preface, p. 4.

again he declares, that (m) *the Old Testament, and Moses, and the Law, and Judaism, are typical of the New Testament, and of Jesus, and of the Gospel, and of Christianity. And I scarce doubt but the whole Body of Hebrew Rites, Ceremonies, and Sacrifices, all their Holy Times, and Places, and Persons, and Things, either have already received, or will in due Time receive their Accomplishment.* This is written like a Christian of primitive Faith and Principle. How Mr. *Lavington* came to make such Concessions and Declarations, I can't guess: But if the Typicalness of *Judaism*, and of the Law; be not better proved by some others, than is done by himself, in the Instance of the *Paschal Lamb*, the *Author of the Discourse* will hardly be converted to Christianity by his Types and Prophecies. His (Mr. *Lavington's*) way of arguing and applying the Type of the *Paschal Lamb*, is like Mr. *Whiston's* mystical Argument for the Authority of the *Apostolical Constitutions*, from the Type of the Law of *Moses*, given on Mount *Sinai*, which the *Author of the Discourse* (n) pleasantly represents, and made me smile.

(m) Ibid. p. 3.

(n) Page 117, 118.

There is an *Anonymous* Writer against the *Author of the Discourse*, who stiles his Performance, *The Nature of the Prophecies of the Old Testament, relating to the Messiah*, which is entirely such a Piece of Gibberish, that for neither Sense nor Nonsense, is hardly to be parallell'd. It was written, if he don't lye, at the Desire of a *Person of Honour*, who, I suppose, might be tainted with Infidelity. When I hear that any *Person of Honour*, or Sense, is convinced by it, the Writer shall be deem'd another *Thaumaturgus*. If this Writer had not, to avoid popular Applause, conceal'd his Name, I would have made Extracts out of his *Pamphlet*, with such Animadversions upon them to his Praise, as would be now lost. So I will only commend him for the Strength and Orthodoxy of his Faith, (o) saying, " Let *Jonas* be a Type, " as our *Author of the Grounds* makes " him; the Circumstance of Time, viz. " the three Days and three Nights he " continued in the Whale's Belly, bears an " exact Proportion to the Time in which " our Saviour continued in the Heart of " the Earth, which was *Three Days* and " *Three Nights* likewise." It is not rea-

sonable for me to put this Writer upon the Proof, that our Saviour *was three Days and three Nights in the Grave*, because it is an Article of his Faith against Sense, Fact, and History. But whoever does prove it, says (p) *St. Jerome*, must make a large Use of the Figure *Synecdoche*, which I question whether the *Author of the Discourse* will allow of in this Case: Therefore must we of necessity have Recourse to the mystical Interpretations of the Prophecy of *Jonas*, and of the *Evangelists*, according to the Fathers, or it will be impossible for us to prove that our *Jesus* dy'd, and rose again, according to the Scriptures.

Another Writer is for taking and giving us a *View of the* (q) *Blunders of this impertinent Infidel, the Author of the Discourse*; of which I will give you one Instance, as a Specimen and Taste of his whole Performance. The *Author of the Discourse* (r) expounding 2 Cor. iii. 6. says, "That St. Paul asserts himself and others to be *Ministers of the New Testament*, as being *Ministers not of the Letter, but of*

(p) *In Matt. c. 12.*

(q) *Christian Religion not founded on Allegory,*
p. 12.

(r) *Page 12.*

“ *the Spirit* of the Law, that is, of the “ Old Testament, spiritually understood ;” in which he argues with, and expounds like the Fathers of the Church, as (s) Dr. *Whitby* does acknowledge. But this notable Writer (t) of *The Christian Religion not founded on Allegory*, says, “ this Exposition is directly contrary to the Apostle’s Meaning, which is plainly this, That God has enabled us to be Ministers of a new Covenant, to be Ministers not of a written Law, that barely points out our Duty, but of the Holy Ghost, that gives Strength to perform it ; not of external Ordinances, but of inward Purity ; not of the Law of *Moses*, but of the Gospel.” Which of these two Writers is mistaken in his Exposition of the Words of *St. Paul*, the Reader may judge ; and by this single Instance we may see, what a Discoverer this Writer is, of the *Author of the Discourse’s* Blunders.

Again, the said Writer is for taking a View of the (u) Blasphemies of the *Author of the Discourse*, &c. but forgot to specify them ; and I can’t imagine what he means by them, excepting his Disbelief of

(s) *In Locum.*

(t) Page 96.

(u) *Ibid.* p. 12.

Christianity, for want of better Arguments, in its Advocates, to prove the Truth of it: But I know not how to call this Blasphemy. St. *John* speaks of the Worshipers of the Beast, who will (w) *blaspheme* God and his *Tabernacle*: These Blasphemers are, according to the Fathers, pretended Christians, but profess'd Enemies to the spiritual, mystical, allegorical, and prophetical Sense of the Old Testament; thereupon the said Writer of the *Christian Religion not founded on Allegory*, had best see to it, that the Title of his Pamphlet be not a-kin to the *Blasphemy against the Holy Spirit* of Prophecy.

But to return, and conclude this my Exhortation to the Clergy, to proceed in this Controversy. Let me tell you, Sirs, the Opinion of *Constantine le Empereur*, who says, (x) *that we Christians don't act wisely, who so much disregard the Authority of the Fathers in Controversy; we betray our Ignorance in the Contempt of them; and they alone proceed rightly in Disputation, who*

(w) Revel. xiii. 6.

(x) In Controversiis Christianorum de Dogmatibus fidei non satis prudenter agunt, qui Patres imprimis antiquissimos susque deque habent; Inscitiam etiam produnt, qui eosdem contemnunt: recte vero in disputando progrediuntur, qui reverendorum Patrum Auctoritatem accersunt. *In Clavis Talmud. Præfat. p. 9.*

appeal to their Authority. This in no Case is more true, than in the Controversy before us, which, the Authority of the Fathers, if treated with Veneration and due Respect, would soon determine. There are some Controversies between Papists and Protestants, and among Protestants one with another, that, as *Dallee* rightly observes, the Fathers don't at all touch on; neither can their Testimonies be fairly cited on either Side. But of the Controversy before us, they are full, ample, and express; neither is there any Thing, for which they are so clear, as for the Old Testament's being entirely typical and prophetical of Christ and his Church, and for the allegorical Interpretation of it, in order to apprehend and discern the Spirit of Prophecy that is in it.

Hear, *Good Sirs*, what *St. Clement of Alexandria* says, that (y) *the whole Oeconomy of the Law is typical and prophetical; and that Moses and the Prophets wrote all in Parables; and that (z) the Symbolical and Hieroglyphical Philosophy is most useful and*

(y) Η δε οικονομία αὐτῆ καὶ προφητικὴ. Strom. Lib. II. c. 19. Καὶ ἡ προφητεία καὶ ὁ νομὸς ἐν παρεβολαῖς ἐκλήθησαν δὲ αὐτοῦ. Ibid. Lib. VI. c. 15.

(z) Το συμβολικὸν τοῦτο καὶ αἰνιγματώδες εἶδος χρησιμοῦται, πολλὸν δὲ ἀναγκασιότατον τῇ γνῶσει τῆς ἀληθείας ὑπαρχόν. Ibid. Lib. II. C. 1.

neces-

necessary for the understanding of their Prophecy. Hear what Origen, the Disciple of St. Clement, says, (a) That Moses and the Prophets wrote altogether under the Obscurities of Parables, Enigmas, and Allegories; and that (b) the Wisdom and Learning of a Christian consisted in the Interpretation and Application of the said prophetic Enigmas and Parables. Hear what Tertullian says, that (c) the Law is Spiritual and Prophetical, and in almost all Points Figurative: And that (d) the Enigmas and Parables of it are to be understood in another Sense than that in which they are written. For (e) our Lord himself would have us to aim at the sublime Sense of the Law, in which he came to fulfil it. Hear what Athanasius

(a) Prophetæ arcana & vulgari Captu sublimiora obscuris Figuris convelarunt, Ænigmati, Allegorii, Paraboli, &c. *Com. Cels. Lib. VIII.*

(b) Verus Christianismus consistit in Interpretatione & Enarratione prophetorum Ænigmatum, Parabolarumque aliarumque Figurarum. *Ibid. Lib. I.*

(c) Ut nihil de Arcanis attingam significantiis Legis spiritualis & prophetiæ, & in omnibus pæne Argumentis figuratæ. *Adv. Marcion. Lib. II. c. 19.*

(d) Pleraque figurate portenduntur per ænigmata & Parabolas, aliter intelligenda quam scripta sunt. *Ibid. Lib. III. c. 5.*

(e) Dominus vult altius Legem intelligi, per carnalia, significantem spiritalia, & hoc Nomine non destruens, sed extruens Legem. *Ibid. Lib. IV. c. 19.*

says,

says, That (f) all Things, whether Historical or not, that are written in the Law and the Prophets, are prophetic of what will come to pass in a suitable manner, under the New Testament; and accordingly, (g) the Law is spiritually to be interpreted, or it is useless for the Proof of Christ's being the Life and Completion of it. Hear what St. Hilary says, that (h) the Law is a Glass thro' which we behold Things to come under the Gospel: For the Gospel is nothing else than the spiritual Sense of the Law of Moses; whose Writings are a seal'd Book, that is not to be open'd, but by a spiritual Interpretation of it. Hear what St. Jerome says, that (i) all the Scriptures of the Old Testament, mystically treat of Things to come under the Gospel: And whatsoever is written of the old Israelites literally, is in a spiritual Sense to be one Time or other

(f) Κατα συνεχειαν μιν ουν ειρησαι, οια εστι τα του νομου, και των προφητων, και τα ισορουμενα παντα μελα της καινης διαθηκης. In Epist. ad Marcellin. Sect. 27.

(g) Μινδεν ηρουμενοι τα νομου, ει μη νοοντο πνευματικως, ανυστελες γαρ. &c. In Fragm. Ps. 2.

(h) Lex est speculum futurorum. — Lex Evangelica quæ est spiritus Legis. — Signantur omnia Legis & per solam spiritalem Doctrinam resignanda. In Ps. 119.

(i) Omnis scriptura & specialiter Prophetæ futurorum Mysteriis involuti sunt. In Isai. c. 18. Quicquid Populo Israel carnaliter promittitur, in Nobis spiritualiter completum & compleri monstramus. In Prefat. L. IV. in Jerem.

fulfilled

fulfilled in Christ's Church. Lastly, Hear and Read (k) *St. Augustin*, who by many Arguments against *Fauftus*, proves the Writings of *Moses* and the Prophets to be prophetical and typical, though the Spirit of Prophecy, at present, might not be clearly discern'd in them.

I could multiply Testimonies, like those above, out of the Fathers, to a vast Number, if there was Occasion for't. And indeed I had not now mention'd so many; if the Clergy in general of this Age, *who should be Teachers of others*, as (l) *St. Paul* says, had not been such Strangers to the Fathers, Apostates from primitive Doctrine, Despisers of Prophecys, and Enemies to Allegories, as *that they have Need that one teach them again, which be the first Principles of the Oracles of God*: Which *στοιχεια αρχης των λογων*, fundamental Principles of Christianity exist in the fore-said Opinions of the Fathers, or we shall never arrive at the understanding of Divine Oracles.

But when I speak of the Apostacy of our Age, I would not be understood to mean that it's so universal, as that God has left himself without Witness, to the Truth

(k) *Contra Faustum, Lib. XII. Sect. 37, 38.*

(l) *Heb. v. 12.*

above: Our present most Reverend and Learned Archbishop of *Canterbury* says, (m) the allegorical Interpretation of the Scripture, is justifiable on the Authority of the Apostles and Fathers of the Church. The great *Huetius* (n) pleads too hard for it. And the famous *Dodwell* not only says, as above cited, that the Apostolical Reasonings imply'd, that the whole *Old Testament* was prophetical of the *New*, but also that the (o) prophetical Stile was Symbolical and Enigmatical, and that (p) *Oneirocriticks* and *Hieroglyphicks* are of Use towards the understanding of the prophetical Books of the *Old Testament*. And though none of these great Men attain'd to the Art of Interpretation of Oracles (which is reserv'd, says *St. Clement* (q) of *Alexandria*, for Men of peculiar Gifts and Talents at Parables) yet it is to their Praise and Honour, that they adhered to the Divine Doctrine aforesaid, upon the Authority of the *Antients*, both *Jews* and Fathers.

(m) In his Dissertation on *Barnabas's* Epistle.

(n) In *Demonstrat. Evang.* p. 639.

(o) *Aliz rursus Prophetiæ, pro usitato Prophetiarum Idiomate, symbolis, ænigmatibus involutæ, ut ægre intelligi possit, quænam sit prophetæ aut Numinis Sententia.* *Dissert. Cyprian.* p. 61.

(p) *His Letters of Advice*, p. 208.

(q) *Διο δι τοις εκλεξοις των ανθρωπων — μεθυμενα τα αγια των προφητειων μυσηγια.* *Strom. Lib. VI.*

And what's remarkable is, that when *Luther*, the Founder of Protestantism, at the (r) Instigation of the Devil, first roar'd (s) against the Fathers, for their Allegories on the Law and the Prophets; then did God open the Mouths of some (t) *Anabaptists* to his Reproof, declaring, that the literal Sense of the Scriptures was of *Anti-christ*: Which I was surprized at the Reading of, and think them nothing less than inspired, or they could never have hit upon that Primitive and Apostolical Doctrine about *Antichrist*, without reading the Fathers, who are exactly of the same Mind: Neither, by the by, is there any other Reason to be assign'd, why *St. Paul* calls *Anti-christ*, the *Avopuθ*, (which we unhappily translate the *wicked One*) but because he is the *Adversary* to the Spirituality of the Law, or to the Spirit of Prophecy that is in the Law of *Moses*.

(r) *Discourse of the Grounds*. p. 61.

(s) Sæpe testatus sum me valde abhorrere ab Allegoriis & damnare earum studium; quia Exempla & Vestigia Patrum me terrent, qui suis Allegoriis obscurant Doctrinam. — Hortor itaque Studiosos Theologiæ, ut fugiant hoc Genus Interpretationis in sacris Litteris, quia Allegoria est perniciofa. *In Genes. cap. 30.*

(t) Sensum literalem provenire aiunt ex homine veteri, ex naturali Mundi Spiritu, atque ex Anti-christo. *Glassi. Philolog. Sacr.* p. 264.

I have

I have no more at present to add, *Sirs*, than to beseech you to hold in *Earnest*, what the *Author of the Discourse* does but in *Jest*, the *Affirmative* of the Question in Dispute, *viz.* *That the Old Testament is entirely typical and prophetical of the New, and that it is impossible to prove our Jesus to be the Messiah, any otherwise, than by shewing how he does, and will fulfil all that is written in the Law and the Prophets.* If you will heartily embrace this Opinion, and endeavour to illustrate the Truth of it, you shall not want my Assistance. I know not what you may think; but I am sure I have done you signal Service already, in rescuing the *Five Prophecies* of the *Old Testament*, that are cited by the *Evangelists*, out of the Hands and Objections of your *Adversary*: And if either he or you give me Occasion, I can write more largely to the Support and Illustration of the said Prophecies. But if you will not be prevail'd on to espouse the *Affirmative* of the Question, and write manfully in Defence of it (as I am not without Apprehensions you will not, because of the Consequence of it) then I turn my self to the *Author of the Discourse*, &c. to whom I address my self in the manner following.

I heartily thank you, Sir, for your *Discourse of the Grounds, &c.* which is a great Curiosity, and such a Production, as I could not flatter my self with the hopes of seeing. These Thanks proceed not from my Approbation of your Principles, nor from the Similitude of my Faith or Infidelity with yours (you have more Reason and Learning, and are better able to pass a Judgment on this *Moderatorial Treatise*, than to conclude so) but from the Consideration of the Usefulness of your *Work*, which will tend more to the Discovery and Illustration of Truth, than almost all the Books which have been written in these last Ages. It was to a *Celsus* that the Church ow'd her *Origen*, who neither would, nor could have written with that Acuteness and Strength of Reason, in Defence of Christianity, if the other's *Satyr* against our Religion, had not sharpen'd his Wit and Pen. So your ingenious and learned Performance, which closely attacks Christianity, will quicken and arouse our modern Advocates for Religion, out of their wonted Dulness and Impertinence, to a proper Vindication of it; or they must of necessity part with it, if you persist in your Objections, and continue to batter the Church with such Armour.

Your

Your *Apology*, by way of Preface, Sir, for Mr. *Whiston's Liberty of Writing*, is most rational; and it was kindly and charitably done of you; and it's a Sign of your sincere Affection for him, that you publish'd it. I know not whether he has given you Thanks, and express'd his Obligations to you for it; but I am sure it is his Duty to do it. For his *Essay*, and Design to bring our good *Old Bible* into Dis-esteem, and to publish a *New one* of his own Invention, for the Use of Posterity, is so provoking, that I wonder how he escaped the *Blanket* at least, before you so seasonably interposed between him and Danger. If our *Clergy*, and other Preachers, had not been bridled by the Civil Authority, or if they had not been abated of the Zeal and Mettal of their Ancestors, he must have gone to Pot. The greatest Advocates for Liberty of Conscience among Protestant Priests, such as was *John Calvin* himself, would not formerly have born with Mr. *Whiston*, but would have committed him to the Flames, or the Gallows, after *Servetus*; and when they had done it, being *Men of Reserves and Distinctions* upon such Occasions too, would have nicely distinguish'd between Persecution for Conscience, and Zeal for God's Glory, which, I dare say, in the Opinion of some *now*, would justify the worst

worst Treatment that could be given him. But, I thank God, Mr. *Whiston*, for whom you and I have a Respect, is out of Danger, through your kind Interposition in his Behalf. And as the Strength of your Reasons for *Liberty of Writing*, and the Potency of your Arguments against his pernicious Design to annul the Authority of our Bible, has preserv'd him at present from Protestant Fury; so, for his future Security, I will do what I can to make him such an inconsiderable and contemptible Writer, as shall effectually remove the Rage and Indignation of the *Clergy* against him.

Some, perhaps, *Sir*, may be apt to think, that your own Book stood in need of such an *Apology* for *Liberty of Writing*; and that it was more for your own Safety, than for Mr. *Whiston's*, that you publish'd it. But none that consider the Difference of your Cases, can think so. The worst that can be said of you, is, that you have publish'd some Doubts and Scruples about Prophecies, which our eminent *Divines* had occasion'd; and which, to avoid giving Offence to weak Brethren, you have cover'd under good Arguments, for the prophetic Interpretation of the Old Testament. But Mr. *W.* openly and professedly denies the Authority of our *Bible*,
upon

upon which many Thousands of good Protestants, having read it to their Consolation and Instruction, are gone to Heaven. This is so provoking, that none hardly, but *Gentlemen* of your Candour, could bear with.

But whether you, *Sir*, or *Mr. W.* stood most in Need of such an *Apology*, I care not. It's nothing to me, who will be so cautious in the Opinions and Principles I advance, as to want no such Excuse for them. Though I do write against *Protestantism*, as well as *Popery*, and against the *Hire* of our Priests, as well as their *Ministry* of the Letter, which some may think very provoking of our good humour'd *Clergy*; yet the Authority of the Fathers, for whom they, as well as I, should have a Veneration, is my Protection; and I will never be beholden to such an *Apology* as yours is. So long as I keep within the Bounds of primitive Doctrine, as in truth I can't write Sense without it, I am safe. The *Bishops* and *Fathers* of this Church, for that similitude of Name they bear to the *Fathers* of the primitive Church, will not only guard me against the Rage of their *subordinate Pastors* and *Curates*; but unquestionably will do all the Honour they can, to a Man
so

so singularly skill'd in the antient and primitive Writings, as I am.

But after all the Praises and Commendations of your *Apology for Liberty of Writing*, let me tell you, Sir, there are two or three Defects in it. The

First is, That you forgot to enlarge on the Excellency of our Civil Government, on its tender Regard for Liberty of Conscience, and that Freedom to write and print our Minds about Religion, which Mr. *W.* and you too (as others think) in an extraordinary manner, reap the Benefit of. This Indulgence of our Governors, proceeds not from their Coolness and Indifferency about Religion, but is founded on primitive Principles, and a right Zeal for the Truth, which they are conscious can no otherwise be search'd into, found out, and propagated, than by *Liberty of Writing*. Neither do I think, for all this, (notwithstanding the Insinuation of Priests sometimes to the contrary) that our Governors want a real Affection for our establish'd Church. It's a Sign still, that they are zealous on her Side, or they would not, for the better Preservation of the Church, keep the Clergy out of *Convocation*: Which though some may think a depriving them of that Freedom of Debate *within* Doors, which

which others enjoy *without*, yet I am of an Opinion, that it's of Advantage to the *Clergy*, that their Hands and their Tongues are thus ty'd up, or they might be bringing Ruin upon themselves, as well as executing their Wrath upon such Authors as are you and Mr. *W.* And therefore you Two, as well as the *Clergy*, ought to express your Thankfulness for the Happiness of the Administration you live under.

Secondly, If you, Sir, in your *Apology* for Mr. *Whiston's* Liberty of Writing, had more inveigh'd against Subscriptions to a Set of Principles and Opinions, you had done well. Oaths and Subscriptions to Forms and Tenets in Religion, are certainly a great Lett and Impediment to an Enquiry into Truth. Some Men will think themselves bound in Conscience to abide by what they have sworn and subscribed to; and if they should happen to be convinc'd of their Errors, yet for Credit and Reputation's sake, will not openly write against them: And such Men commonly are of the clearest Heads, as well as of the greatest Modesty, who, if their Shackles of Subscriptions were broken off, would be Truth's best Advocates. And though such Oaths and Subscriptions in this last Age, have not been that Hindrance to the Ad-

U

vance-

vancement of Truth, as one in Speculation might have thought ; for they are Things that the *Clergy* play fast and loose with, and do both write and preach too against, as well as for the establish'd Doctrine of the Church ; yet for all that, they may be accounted Truth's Enemies, in as much as they are or ought to be obligatory. I know not whether any of the *Clergy* wish these weak Fences of the Church laid quite open, which their own Breach through, has brought Disgrace upon themselves, as well as a Burden upon their Consciences ; but I wonder they don't desire such a Release, when they might change their Principles without Reproach, write for or against any Opinions in Religion without Fault, and freely exercise their Wit for the Edification and Instruction of others. But whatever they may desire and think in this Case ; as solemn Subscriptions to Articles of Religion, and their Violation of them have been the Infamy of the *Clergy*, the Nursery of Ignorance, and the Cause of Infidelity ; so I believe the Essence of the New *Jerusalem*, which will descend from above, will consist in a Freedom to hold what is right in our Eyes, when, as (u) *St. Clement of Alexandria* says,

(u) *Ιεροσολημι δηλοῖ δε προφητικῶς τοὺς εἰρηνικῶς ἐποπτεύοντες.* Strom. Lib. I.

Men without Restraint, will quietly contemplate on Divine Things. But,

Thirdly, Interest, when Ecclesiastical Revenues are appropriated to a Set of Men of particular Principles, is another Impediment to a free Enquiry after Truth. You, *Sir*, should have more enlarg'd on this Topick, and I wonder how a Man of your Penetration and Zeal for Truth, could pass it by. Interest is the greatest Bias on the Judgment, that does so blind Men's Eyes, that they will not, though they do, see their Errors. The Prejudice of Education, and the Obligation of Oaths, are not, comparatively, so great Stumbling-Blocks in the way of Truth, as is *Interest*. This will hold Men fast to any the worst of Errors. Neither is there any Worship so irrational, that even intelligent Persons for Preferment will not conform to. The Clergy will allow of this Truth, if their own Inconstancy in Religion, and Mutability of their Ecclesiastical Shapes, for *filthy Lucre's* sake did not prove it. And though we hear now and then of a Priest, that for Religion, and a good Conscience, will give up his Interest, yet what's that to the rest of them. A *Calf* will have his Worshippers for Interest sooner than the *Holy Jesus*; and *Mammon* more Vo-

U 2

taries

taries than the God of Heaven. An establish'd Hire for Priests to officiate in holy Things, is so absurd and nonsensical, that one may wonder how it came in Use. If God will have his Ministers among Men, let him call them to the Office, as he did Aaron, and be their Inheritance. There is no more Reason why Men should pay God's Priests, than why they should impose them on him. If God's Priests are to receive their Wages of Men, they will tell Lies of him for their own Advantage.

Aulus Gellius says, there's no (x) Credit to be given to a *South-sayer* and *Diviner*, who officiates for Victuals and Money, for he will sooth the People up with fine Words, to enrich himself. And *St. Clement of Alexandria* says, (y) that it should be the principal Care of a Minister of Christ, to keep himself unsuspected of covetous Designs upon the Purses of the People. The primitive Preachers of the Gospel did, as (z) *Origen* says, not only so

(x) Nihil credo Auguribus, qui aures Verbis divitant alienas, suas ut auro locupletant Domos. *Noſt. Ant. Lib. XIV. c. 1.*

(y) Ο δε δὲ υπομνημαῖς λαλῶν, πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν ἀποσπύλας, μὴ κέρσεως ἐνεκα, &c. *Strom. Lib. I.*

(z) Nec objici potest Christianos Lucri Causa, qui nisi coguntur præ Inopia, recusant accipere Victui necessaria. *Cont. Cels. Lib. III.*

acquit themselves of all Suspicion of worldly Aims after *filthy Lucre*, but have left many *Invectives* upon Record, like these (a) *referr'd* to, against *Preaching for Hire*; which shew, that they never imagin'd that *Divination for Money* would ever come again into Use, unless it was according to *St. Augustin*, under an (b) *Anti-Christian Priesthood*. It would be of good Use to make a large Collection of Testimonies, which the Fathers abound with, against an *Hireling Priesthood*, which no Man, Sir, is abler to do than your self, nor can publish it with a better Grace. The Clergy do account you a considerable Adversary, or they would not, in *Politicks*, have taken so much Notice of you. And as you are endow'd with an honest Zeal for the Advancement of true Wisdom; so I hope it will prompt you to make such a *Collection*, with your Notes on it, which will touch Error, Heresy, and Ignorance to the Quick.

(a) Ergo ne quid in Ministerio nostro Venale sit, admonemur, neque hoc Apostolatus nostri opus fiat, Auri & Argenti Possessio. *Hilar. in Matt. c. 10. Sect. 5.* Omnes Sacerdotes qui Domum Patris faciunt Domum Negotiationis & Lucra quærunt de Populis, Cananæi appellandi sunt. *Hieron. in Proph. Osee, cap. 4.*

(b) In Libro de Anti-Christo.

We

We read how our Saviour drove the Buyers and Sellers of Sheep and Oxen, &c. out of the Temple; which Story I believe nothing of according to the Letter; for it is recorded but as a Parable, according to the (c) Fathers, of what he will do to *Babylonish* Merchants, and Ministers of the Letter, who sell (d) *Bulls* and *Blunders*, &c. And why may not you, with your Wit and Reason, in the mean while, be lashing such *Mercenaries* out of the Church, which they have turn'd into a *Den of Thieves*?

The *Bishop* of *Lichfield*, *Dr. Clark*, and others, are for literal Prophecies, and literal Accomplishments, of which, in their own Imaginations, they have collected great Numbers for your Information and Conversion. Can't you, Sir, by way of Return, for their Instruction, put them in Mind of the Prophecy in *Micah*, that's come to pass in our Church, that Priests

(c) Non enim habebant (Judæi) quod venire possent neque erat, quod emere quis posset: sed Præfiguratio futurorum dictis præsentibus continetur. Ecclesiæ Vicia in ipso Dominicæ Claritatis Adventu esse purganda. *Hilar. in Matt. cap. 21. Sect. 4.* Ingredietur Christi potestas in Ecclesiam & ejiciet Videntes, &c. *Origen. in Matt. cap. 21. Tract. 16.*

(d) Πολλοι των Αρχιερεων αμαρτανουσι τοιαυτα, τους βοας, πωλουντες εν τη Εκκλησια. *Theophyl. in Johan. Evang. cap. 4.*

(e) *preach for Hire, and divine for Money*, and then ask them why this Prophecy may not be received into the Number of their literal ones. I am for the allegorical Interpretations of the Law and Prophets ; but for all that, upon the Authority of the (f) Fathers, I believe and experience, there are some literal Intermixtures of Prophecies, which are rarely discernable, without allegorizing the Context. But the Prophecy before us stares us in the Face, could never have respect to the Priests in the Days of *Micah*, but has had to this Day its completion under the Gospel in a scandalous manner : And I know not why you should not teaze the Clergy a little with it ; and then appeal to the World, whether they are not more blind than your self, against the Light of Prophecy, and more incorrigible and inflexible upon the Evidence and Force of it. It is plain enough from St. *Jerome*, (g) that this Prophecy of *Micah* points at the *Bishops, Priests, and*

(e) Micah iii. 11.

(f) Sunt quædam ita pronunciata in Scripturis, ut Allegoriæ Nubilo carent. *Tertul. de Carnis Resur. cap. 28.*

(g) Si quis autem hæc——ad Ecclesiam transferat——liquido pervidebit, quod Principes & Sacerdotes non sint alii nisi Episcopi, Presbyteri, & Diaconi. *In Locum.*

Deacons of our Times. Whereupon you might here raise a pleasant Controversy to the Diversion of the Town; in which, if I am appointed *Moderator*, I would make this Proposal (for the sake of Peace and Reconciliation) that you should subscribe to the Truth of Christianity upon their obscure Prophecies, and absurd Applications of them, if they will renounce *Priest-Craft*, and part with their *Wages of Unrighteousness*, upon that most clear and manifest Prediction of *Micah*, that can be levell'd at them. Which of you will be the forwardest to come into this Proposal, is not hard to guess.

But whether you, *Sir*, will do this, and so enlarge your *Apology* for *Liberty of Writing*, or not; I hope you will renew your Assault upon the Church, into whose dirty Walls you have made a large Breach. You don't want for Armour and Artillery to ply against her. Your own *Magazine* of Learning is not only well stored, but your late Opponents, the pretended Defenders of Christianity, have put fresh Weapons and Ammunition into your Hands. And if you don't make another Attack soon upon the Church, the Clergy will glory and insult, that they have beaten you with the poorest *Flirts* and *Squirts* of Reason and Arguments, that ever, in
my

my Opinion were used in the Field of Polemical Theology.

I don't in the least question then, but you will assault the Church, and her Guards again; neither do I hope for this, as if I wish'd Christianity subverted, but only to make the Advocates for Religion, and the pretended Guards of the Church, to betake themselves to the proper Arguments and Weapons of Defence. The true Church of Christ is founded on a Rock, which no Power nor Force of the Wit and Reason of her Enemies, will be able to storm and beat down: And if in the End your Infidelity should be baffled, the *Clergy* will not triumph. The Church's Victory will be more to their Shame, than your Dishonour. And you can't ingloriously depart the Field of Battle, when the *Clergy* will grieve most to see you conquer'd. Nay, when the Truth of Christianity shall be clearly proved, and establish'd on its sure Foundation of Prophecy, it will turn to your great Honour, who have been such a necessary and useful Means of it. And whether you, or the *Clergy*, wish most to see the Church of Christ establish'd on her firm Basis of the allegorical and prophetical Sense of the Scriptures, is no Question.

The Clergy reproach you with writing against Christianity, under the Disguise of writing for it: Can't you turn quick upon them; and prove that they, in their Writings, advance such Principles that are, in Reason, and upon the Authority of the Fathers, destructive of all Religion. I need not direct you to this Proof, it being obvious, that they, upon Consequence, may be charged with *Atheism*, and downright Enmity to Christianity, mask'd with godly Pretences. Neither would I absolutely advise you to enter upon such a Proof; because the Clergy will bring themselves off by an Acknowledgment of the Weakness of their Understandings, and clearly acquit themselves of all Malice and Hatred to Christ's Church, because of the worldly Interests they reap in her; otherwise they might be taken upon Suspicion, for the worst Adversaries to the Christian Religion, that ever wrote.

But at them again, I beseech you, Sir, with your more open Objections, against either the *literal* or *allegorical* Interpretations of the Scriptures. Tell them plainly, that you'll believe nothing of Christianity, till they have made Christ's *Messiahship* clearly out, from his Completion of the Types and Prophecies of the Old Testament. Reproach them with their Apostacy

stacy from the Doctrine of the primitive Church, concerning Prophecy : Or, if you will, ridicule the Fathers of the Church, after your wonted manner, for a Crew of whimsical maggot-pated Fellows, or they would never have form'd such Chimerical Notions on the Scriptures, which, according to the celebrated (b) Mr. Daltree, have no more Solidity in them than Castles of Cards, which little Children are wont to make. Make a large Collection of their allegorical Whimsies, and expose them to the Ridicule and Laughter of wise Men (for which Work the Fathers and I will forgive you) and then appeal to the World, whether our Clergy are not a Company of credulous *Fools*, to take a Religion upon Trust, from such weak, easy, fanciful, and superstitious Men, as the Apostles and Fathers of the Church were, whose Principles they are ashamed of, and, for the Honour of their Religion, are forc'd to depart from them. Or if the Clergy disdain to be call'd *Fools* in this Case; then, to mend the Matter, tell the World what K--- they are, for Interest only, to adhere to a Religion, which they know in their Consciences, is not tenable upon the Principles

(b) *Of the Use of the Fathers*, Book II. Chap. 3.

and Opinions of its first Founders, whom over and over again, they confess to be ignorant, erroneous, and faulty Men.

You have, *Sir*, I think, to this Purpose already, with your Wit, lash'd *St. Paul*, *St. John*, *St. Barnabas*, *Justin Martyr*, and some others of our primitive Saints, for their allegorical and unintelligible Fancies. It was, I speak it seriously, well done of you : And the Apostles and Fathers of the Church, I dare say, were they now alive, would not blame you, but rather encourage you to do it much more. They and I only intreat you to spare the Holy *Jesus*, and exercise as little of your Satyr upon him and his Words, as may be. You was very hard upon him for that his famous Saying, in *St. Clement* of *Rome*, about his second (i) Advent; which Saying I, when I first read it, many Years since, saluted with Veneration, and with so much the more, after I saw it repeated by *St. Clement* of *Alexandria* ; but am now in a Transport, upon understanding the mystical Sense of it. You, *Sir*, did amiss, by transcribing and publishing that Passage, much more by seeming to sneer at it.

(i) Cum duo erunt unum, & quod foris, ut quod intus est, & masculum cum femina, neque Mas, neque Femina. *Pag.* 256.

Don't you see, our present good *Archbishop* of *Canterbury*, in Regard to the Honour of the Holy *Jesus*, or in Pity to the Weakness of *St. Clement*, has expunged (k) that Passage out of his *English* Translations of the Apostolical Epistles; and, for all that, is as much an Enemy to Mutilations, Interpolations, and corrupt Translations of old Authors, as any one can be: Therefore you, having this Example before you, was to blame for exposing the said Passage to publick View. But if you will make a Collection of the ridiculous Assertions, and Opinions of the Apostles and Fathers of the Church, I will assist you in it, and help you to expose them, and our modern *Clergy*, to Contempt, by the Means of them.

What can be more ridiculous and nauseous, than the Opinion of *St. Augustin*, and of other Fathers, that (l) the Four *Evangelists* were the Four Apocalyptical Beasts, (m) full of Eyes before and behind. I know not what Number of Eyes the *Evangelists* might have in their Heads and Back-

(k) At the End of *St. Clement's* Second Epistle.

(l) Unde mihi videntur, qui ex Apocalypsi illa quatuor Animalia ad intelligendos quatuor Evangelistas interpretati sunt. *De Consens. Evang. Lib. I. Sect. 9.*

(m) Revel. iv. 6.

sides; but you, *Sir*, can't think they had any in their Understandings, or they would never have written such absurd and incoherent Stuff, that, for many Ages of the Church, has puzzled the Pates of the Clergy, who, if they had not gotten a Penny by it, would never have told so many Lies, nor have publish'd such Daubings and Paraphrases to salve their Credit.

Who can make a greater Bull than St. *John*, by calling (n) an *Eagle* a *Beast*; for our *English* Translation is Orthodox, being made by our pious and learned Reformers; neither would our late Interpreters of St. *John*, who, to be sure, are Criticks in the *Greek* Tongue, have let such a Blunder pass uncorrected, if the Word *ζωον* did properly signify any Thing else than a downright *Beast*.

Did not St. *Paul* (o) grossly impose upon the Understandings and Credulity of Men, when he said, he had been caught up into *Paradise*, and heard unspeakable Words, which it is not lawful for a Man to utter. I wonder he did not tell us, whether it was a Chariot or a Basket, that he was taken up, and let down in: But he was so cunning and cautious as to say, he could

(n) Revel. iv. 7.

(o) 2 Cor. xii. 2, 3, 4.

not tell, whether it was in the Body, or out of the Body, that he went to Heaven, because it must needs be very difficult for him to know that, and because the Assertion, one way or other, would have spoil'd the Story, and expos'd it to the Cavils and Exceptions of others.

Who can be more ignorant than *St. Barnabas*, who intimates, (p) that under the Gospel of *Christ*, the *Amalekites* will be again beaten, and much after the same Fashion, they were under the Conduct of *Moses*? If *St. Barnabas* had had any Skill in History and Geography, he might have known that *Amalek* was an extinguish'd Nation: And yet *St. Gregory Nyssen* has no more Wit, than credulously to swallow down this Opinion of *Barnabas*, and to tell us how (q) *Moses's* Hands will be again lifted up in the Day of Battle.

No less ignorant is *Origen* himself, for saying, that the (r) *Moabites*, and *Ammonites*, would not be received into the

(p) *In Epist. c. 12.*

(q) *Sublatio Manuum Moſis ſignificat Legis in altiffimos Sensus Accommodationem, Demiffio vero humilem, terrenam & literalem Expositionem. De Vita Moſis, p. 217.*

(r) *Sed hæc, qui ſciat, quid de Ammonitis & Moabit ſcriptura dicit, qui in tertiam & quartam Progeniem non introibunt in Eccleſiam Domini. In Genef. cxix. Rom. 5.*

Church, till the third or fourth Age of her *Wilderness* State. I wonder in my Heart, where he imagin'd those Nations, whose Name and Memorial is bury'd and forgotten, would be then found: But St. *Ferome*, to salve the Reputation of *Ori-gen*, tells us (but we have more Wit than to believe him) that these *Moabites* and *Ammonites* are (s) Hereticks and Apostates of the latter Times; and (t) he and other Fathers make such a lively Representation of their Priests, as if they had some Folks in view.

But what more absurd than St. *Augustin*'s (u) Assertion, that the poor (x) Woman of the Gospel, whom Satan had bow'd down, and who labour'd under a Spirit of Infirmity, was a Type of the Church, and that this very Age, in which we now live, is the 18th Year of her Infirmity, and she is accordingly to be healed by our Jesus. I, having some Regard for the Authority of

(s) Moab & Ammon juxta Tropologiam sunt Hæretici, qui sub Nomine Christi censentur, & vicini magis quam Habitatores Terræ sanctæ. In *Jerem. cap. 12.*

(t) Vid. *Hieron. in Ezekiel. cap. 25.*

(u) Illa Mulier curvata intelligitur figurare Ecclesiam, quam in sexta Mundi ætate a Captivitate Diaboli Jesus liberabit. In *Quest. 25. Dialog. 65. Quest.*

(x) Luke xiii. 11.

St. *Augustin*, could not forbear making farther Enquiry after this Woman. And, for want of better Authors and Historians, I examin'd the Fathers thoroughly; who, to pass by many Particulars of her Life, told me, she now cohabited with one G O G, whether in a conjugal or adulterous State, I'll not say; but they positively affirm'd, that the *Clergy* of this Day are the Children of that unhappy Couple. I could not tell how to believe this, nor to gain-say it. But when St. *Cyril* of *Alexandria* told me, that our *Clergy* were all bow'd down to the Earth, like their Mother; and without any Ears, Eyes, and other Senses, like their Father, then I deny'd the whole; and who would not? For our *Clergy* are as upright, smug, and clever Fellows, as ever were of the Priesthood: But for all this, St. *Cyril* stood to't, that they were deform'd to the last degree; and *sine Testibus* too, which was the Reason they could not Propagate: And moreover, the Fathers were unanimously positive that our *Clergy*, for Deformity, are the Men excepted against by the Law of *Moses*, as unqualified for the Priesthood; because the *Petalon* of Wisdom, the *Ephod* of Prophecy, the *Logium* of the Law, the *Urim* and *Thummim* of Interpretation, and other sacerdotal Vestments,

Y did

did no more become them, than a *Saddle* did a *Sow's* Back. I forbear to produce Testimonies for this Story, but I can persuade the Fathers to vouch for every Particular of it: For you must know, Sir, that though I have no Talent at the Collection, Connection, and Application of Prophecies, like that of *Bishop Chandler*, *Dr. Clark*, and *Mr. Whiston*, who really equal, if not surpass good old Women in that Way; yet I am an intimate Acquaintance of the Fathers, and can strangely jumble their Authorities together; and if I now applaud my self, it is because I have happen'd to live by bad Neighbours of the Clergy.

Such Stories and Opinions as these, Sir, will expose the Fathers, if not Christianity it self, to the last degree. Those allegorical Whims of the Fathers, which you have instanced in, in your Book, are not fit to be named with mine. But if you will set your Head to work, you may collect a vast Number of their Absurdities, like to these; and by a lively Representation of them, you may make the Clergy to rave against the Fathers more than you can do, if you was to write openly: And if you will, you may upbraid them with the Story last told, and leave it upon me to make out the Truth of it.

And

And when your Hand is in, why should not you expose, and make your self merry with the Traditions of the antient *Jews*, whose Authority the *Clergy* sometimes quote, and who, one would think, should have had more Wit, but are really greater Fools than the Fathers, for monstrous and incredible Stories of their *Messiah*; or they would not believe that he was born long since, and does not reveal himself, but passes his Time in the (y) Garden of *Eden*, till *Elias* shall come to anoint him: Or they would not believe that the *Messiah*, when he is manifested, will first wage (z) War with the *Moabites* (by which Name some latter (a) *Jews* have had the Impudence to stigmatize us good Protestants) and that a Star of Divine Light, will be the Prognostick of his coming against them: Or they would not believe that the *Messiah*, at his coming, would institute a great and most splendid (b) Feast, at which the *Leviathan*

(y) Quidam inter Horti Eden Delicias ævum (Messiam) agitare volunt cum Elia, a quo ungendus est olim Latitiæ Oleo, cum ad Muneris sui Administrationem prodibit. *Apud Bluetium. in Demons. Evang. p. 362.*

(z) Venturum esse Scilonem; Regem Messiam pugnaturumque, contra Edomæos & Moabitas. *Meyr de Gener. Imman. p. 10.*

(a) *Basnage's History of the Jews, p. 383.*

(b) *Ibid. p. 369, 373, 374.*

and *Bebemoth* would be serv'd up in two Dishes, and that *Michael* the Archangel, by Sound of Trumpet, would invite the People to this glorious and delicious Entertainment: Or they would not believe, I say, many more such-like (c) idle Tales, as these of their *Messiah*. I, to confess my Weakness ingenuously, had no more Sense, Sir, than to take these Traditions upon Trust, and did really think with the old *Jews*, that the eating of *Leviathan* and *Bebemoth* (though they were a Fish and a Beast of a most prodigious Size) would not so much fill our *Bellies*, as our *Souls* with Celestial and Divine Knowledge. When I read part of your Book, I was in hopes that you and I should have been two prime Guests at the foresaid Princely Feast; but since you have no Relish for Mysteries, of which I am most voracious, I almost despair of your Company; and so we will leave that *Jewish* Tradition upon the same Foot with the Cabalistical (d) *Marriage-Supper* in *St. John*, of whose Apo-

(c) Novi equidem esse inter illos qui hæc omnia allegorice explicant, quod nempe sub his hyperbolicis & carnalibus figuris magnitudo bonorum & gaudiorum celestium spiritualis adumbretur. *Buxtorf. Synag. cap. 50. p. 745.*

(d) Revel. xix. 17.

calypse you say, (e) that it is certainly a *Master-piece of mystical Prophecy*, being written, as it is said, in a *Cabalistical Stile*. And no doubt but it will appear so, when Things, the most remote from the literal Sense of the Words used, appear intended to be foretold, and shall come to pass; and by coming to pass, shall show the Sense of the Prophecies contain'd therein, perhaps to the Disappointment of every Interpreter it has hitherto had. Which Saying of yours does not want its Pungency.

Go on therefore, *Great and Brave Sir*, and fight and write for the Cause of Infidelity in your own Way. Resume the Pen and the Sword into your Hand. Pursue your Blow, and I'll warrant you, you'll reduce the pretended Guards of the Church to the last Extremity. The War and the Controversy is the most pleasant, useful, and honourable, that ever any *Hero*, in Polemical Theology, was engaged in.

The Controversy, I say, is *pleasant*: Not that it is or ought to be a Pleasure to any one, to put Men into that Rage and Passion, the Clergy seem to be in with you. But as in a State of War and Hostility,

every great *General*, and *Commander* in Chief, is pleas'd to consider the Straits and Distresses of his Enemies; so you, like a *Champion* of another Sort, must of Necessity take Satisfaction at the poor Shifts of your Adversaries. Their mean Efforts of Reason must delight you. And their Flashes of the false Fire of impertinent Argumentation must make you smile. And though the *Bishop* of *Lichfield* has discharged his great *Blunderbuss* against you, you must of Necessity laugh at the Consideration, that he is so poor a *Marksman*. I envy you in this Pleasure, and should have been glad of the like Enjoyment myself; to which Purpose I publish'd several Challenges upon another Question; but the *Clergy* being conscious of the Advantage I had over them, would not engage. But now, whether they will or not, I will reap the Pleasure and Satisfaction of seeing them well beaten by you: And this Pleasure would be transporting, if it was not allay'd with much Pity of their Ignorance, Impertinence, and obstinate Adherence to their Errors.

No less *useful* is this Controversy, if you can cure the People of their Bigotry to an Ignorant, Hireling, and Anti-Christian Priesthood. It is long, long enough, that the true Church has groan'd under

der the Charge of their Maintenance, and the Yoke of their Tyranny; and if you, Sir, can contribute to her Relief, you'll be a Benefactor to Mankind. The Love that you bear to human Nature, and the Service that you, and every good Man owes to his Country, should prompt you to this Work, if there was nothing of Indignation to spur you on to it. The Argument against an *Hireling* Priesthood of Man's Invention, is copious; and as you want not for Wit, Reason, and Learning to manage it; so you may hope to see good Effects of it in the Alienation of the Hearts of the People from modern Preachers. These Nations have a just Aversion to *Popery*, and a *Popish* Priesthood, because of that cruel and persecuting Spirit that rules in them; and it is a wonder to me, that they should be better affected to a Protestant *Clergy*, who are no less ignorant and haughty, but more absurd and inconsistent in their Opinions. All the Good that our Preachers, since the *Reformation*, have done, is not fit to be mentioned, against the Evils and Mischiefs they have occasioned to these Kingdoms. It was in the last Age, that the Fire and Sulphur of the *Protestant* Pulpits of this City did effectually, what the *Papists* before attempted in vain, blow up the King and
Par-

Parliament, and put the whole Kingdom into a Flame, to which succeeding Preachers have been ever since administering the Fuel of Faction and Sedition; neither is it like to be extinguish'd, but upon such Christian Principles, that no Protestant Priest ever held, taught, or practis'd. It is one Wonder to me, that all Men are not turn'd *Atheists*, under such nonsensical and incoherent Preachers; and another Wonder it is, that the human Nature is not chang'd into the wild and rapacious, upon the Examples of such irrational and wolfish Guides: What can be said against these Wonders? Nothing else but that God rules in the Hearts of Men: For, humanly speaking, the Prospect of the Miseries and Calamities that the Priesthood, if they were not bridled by Authority, would be hurrying Mankind into, is deplorable. But you, *Sir*, knowing better than I do, how, to this Purpose, to choose Topicks of Discourse, and with Wit, Reason, and Satyr, to enlarge on them for the Benefit and Instruction of Mankind; let me tell you,

Lastly, That the Controversy will be *honourable* to you, and if you can contribute to the Relief of Mankind, from the Oppression of Priesthood, the Generations

tions to come will celebrate your Praise. Your Work and Labour of Love, for the Good of human Socitey, will be had in everlasting Remembrance. These Kingdoms will loudly proclaim your *Eulogies*, and foreign Nations will eccho and rebound them. Your Name and your Fame will be indelibly inscrib'd, not on a Monument of Marble or Brass, which is liable to the Consumption of Time, but in the Hearts and Voices of the People, saying, this is the *Great C——s*, who, labouring our Deliverance from the intolerable Yoke, Burden, and Tyranny of an ignorant, slothful, and Anti-Christian Priesthood, has laid the Foundation of that (f) Liberty, Ease, and Tranquility we now enjoy. This is *that* illustrious Champion in Polemical Theology, who, by the Acuteness of his Wit, the Strength of his Reason, and the Power of his Learning, vanquish'd many Thousands of our *Babylonish* Preachers, and had gain'd a compleat Victory over all the gods of the Universe, if the alone great, wise, and good God of the Creation, had not, just

(f) Sic extincta Anti Christi Malitia & Impietate compressa requiescet Orbis, qui per tot secula Errori & sceleri nefandam pertulit Servitutem. *Lactant. Instit.* VII. c. 19.

before his Triumph, rais'd a superior Army of Prophets, Apostles, Fathers, Mystics, Oneirocrites, Hieroglyphists, Mythologists, Enigmatists, and Parabolists, to his Conviction and Conversion; and for to his more immortal Honour and Renown made of him a most glorious Saint and Advocate for the Truth in the Holy Jesus: To whom be Glory for ever and ever. *Amen.*

F I N I S



or Ar
My
Mytho
fs, to
nd fo
nown
t and
Holy
r and